



จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย  
ทุนวิจัย  
กองทุนรัชดาภิเษกสมโภช

รายงานวิจัย

นโยบายสวัสดิการสังคมกับความยุติธรรม :  
ผลของนโยบายและทัศนคติต่อการเปลี่ยนแปลงนโยบาย

สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
โดย  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

จท  
ร 15  
013254

พิษณุ เสงี่ยมพงษ์

พฤษภาคม ๒๕๔๘

จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

ทุนวิจัย  
กองทุนรัชดาภิเษกสมโภช



รายงานผลการวิจัย

นโยบายสวัสดิการสังคมกับความยุติธรรม:  
ผลของนโยบายและทัศนคติต่อการเปลี่ยนแปลงนโยบาย

โดย

ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร. พิษณุ เสงี่ยมพงษ์

พฤษภาคม 2548

สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

## Acknowledgement

I would like to extend a special gratitude to undergraduate and graduate students who participated in the study. If this research would have any benefit at all to the academics, the government, and society; part of it is due to all the time and effort that these students spent in responding to the survey.



สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

ชื่อโครงการวิจัย: นโยบายสวัสดิการสังคมกับความยุติธรรม: ผลของนโยบายและทัศนคติต่อการ  
เปลี่ยนแปลงนโยบาย

ชื่อผู้วิจัย: ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร. พิษณุ เสี่ยมพงษ์

เดือนและปีที่ทำวิจัยเสร็จ: พฤษภาคม 2548



### บทคัดย่อ

ระดับ และสาระของนโยบายสวัสดิการสังคม เป็นประเด็นที่ได้รับการถกเถียงอยู่เสมอมา สาขาวิชาต่าง ๆ วัฒนธรรม และค่านิยม ล้วนส่งผลให้สามารถสนับสนุน หรือคัดค้านนโยบายนี้ได้ ในอีกด้านหนึ่งของสวัสดิการสังคม คือประเด็นการแทรกแซงสังคมของรัฐ ที่จะรับสวัสดิการสังคม เข้ามาเป็นภาระหน้าที่ของรัฐ ในระดับใด ประเด็นนี้ ไม่เพียงเป็นประเด็นเชิงปรัชญา แต่เป็น ประเด็นที่ต้องการการเคลื่อนย้ายทรัพยากรในสังคม ทั้งนี้ เนื่องจากทรัพยากรมีจำกัด ทำให้จำเป็นต้องเคลื่อนย้ายทรัพยากรของบางคน ไปสู่บางคน หรือบางกลุ่ม ด้วยเหตุที่ระดับและสาระ ของนโยบายนี้ยากต่อการตัดสิน งานวิจัยนี้จึงเสนอการศึกษานโยบาย ในระดับสากล คือในหลากหลาย ประเทศ ด้วยข้อมูลทุติยภูมิ ว่านโยบายสวัสดิการสังคม มีผลต่อความเท่าเทียม และคุณภาพชีวิต มากหรือน้อยขนาดใด ในฐานะที่เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของความยุติธรรมในสังคม โครงการวิจัย มีจุดประสงค์ที่สอง ที่จะศึกษาทัศนคติของคนไทยกลุ่มหนึ่ง คือกลุ่มนักศึกษา ที่อยู่ในครอบครัวของชนชั้นกลาง ถึงสูง ที่มีต่อนโยบายสวัสดิการสังคมของไทย ด้วยวิธีการศึกษาเชิงสำรวจ ซึ่งจุดประสงค์หลังนี้ มีความสำคัญในสังคมประชาธิปไตย เช่นประเทศไทย เพราะนักการเมืองจำเป็นต้องตอบสนองประชาชน โดยเฉพาะที่เป็นฐานคะแนนเสียง

ผลของการศึกษาแสดงให้เห็นผลลัพธ์เชิงประจักษ์ ของนโยบายสวัสดิการสังคมที่น่าประทับใจ ต่อความเท่าเทียมและคุณภาพชีวิต เมื่อเปรียบเทียบผลดังกล่าวจากนโยบาย กับปัจจัยด้านการเมือง เศรษฐกิจ และสังคม สภาพความเป็นเมือง ในฐานะเป็นปัจจัยด้านสังคม ก็มีผลต่อความเท่าเทียมและคุณภาพชีวิตเช่นกัน ซึ่งเป็นข้อค้นพบที่สอดคล้องกับแนวคิด ทฤษฎี Convergence Thesis การศึกษาเชิงสำรวจ แสดงให้เห็นว่า นักศึกษาไทยกลุ่มที่ศึกษา มีทัศนคติด้านบวก กับนโยบายสวัสดิการสังคมและความเท่าเทียม ถึงแม้ว่าประเภทของความเท่าเทียมที่จำเป็นต้องมีการเคลื่อนย้ายทรัพยากรค่อนข้างมากจะได้รับการสนับสนุนในระดับที่น้อยกว่า จากการวิเคราะห์ผลวิจัย และวรรณกรรมด้านสวัสดิการสังคม โครงการวิจัยนำเสนอ New Convergence Thesis โดยอภิปรายว่า ในประการแรก ผลเชิงบวกของนโยบาย ตามที่ได้ค้นพบ



เชิงประจักษ์ในการศึกษาครั้งนี้ จะยังทำให้ประเทศที่ไม่ใช่รัฐสวัสดิการ จะคล้อยตามด้านนโยบายกับประเทศที่เป็นรัฐสวัสดิการ ซึ่งมักเป็นประเทศตะวันตกที่พัฒนาแล้ว คือจะยังคงมีบทบาทในนโยบายอยู่ ประการที่สอง ประเทศที่เป็น และที่ไม่ใช่รัฐสวัสดิการ จะเคลื่อนเข้าหากันเอง คือ จะดำเนินการในลักษณะคล้ายกัน ในแง่ของการโอนภาระงานด้านนโยบายสวัสดิการสังคม สู่ภาคเอกชนมากขึ้น โดยเฉพาะในด้านการให้บริการสังคม อย่างไรก็ตาม รัฐก็ยังคงจะมีบทบาทในด้านการสนับสนุนงบประมาณให้แก่ภาคเอกชน ในฐานะเป็นผู้ควบคุม และให้หลักประกันว่า ต้องมีการให้บริการด้านสวัสดิการสังคมที่เพียงพอ และที่มีสาระ คุณภาพที่เหมาะสม แม้ว่า ในบางกรณี เอกชนจะเป็นผู้ให้บริการ



สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

**Project Title:** Welfare Policy and Social Justice: Policy Result and Attitude toward Policy Change.

**Name of the Investigator:** Pisanu Sangiampongsa, Ph. D. (Assistance Professor).

**Year:** May 2005.

### Abstract

The extent and substance of social welfare policy have been a contentious issue. Academic disciplines, culture, and values all contribute to the argument for and against it. Within the issue is also the question regarding the amplitude of government's role in social welfare policy, which is a form of state intervention. The issue is not only philosophical, but also requires resource relocation. Since the social resource is scarce, its relocation means taking some from certain individuals and giving it to others. Since the appropriate level of welfare is hard to determine, this study proposes to examine, on the global scale, the empirical effect of state's social welfare policy on equality and social well-being as forms of social justice. Secondary data are compiled for the study. The second objective is to study a group of people's attitude by surveying the attitude of some Thai students from middle class families or above toward social welfare policy, as politicians in a democratic society like Thailand must be responsive to citizens, especially their constituents.

The finding suggests impressive result of social welfare policy on equality and social well-being, when it is compared to political, economic, and social factors. Urbanization, as a social factor, is also associated well with equality and quality of life, hence, supporting the Convergence Thesis. The survey of Thai university students shows their favorable attitude toward social welfare policy and social equality, although the type of equality that requires more extensive resource relocation receives less support. The study introduces the New Convergence Thesis from the finding and literature, while proposing two main arguments. One, the impressive result of social welfare policy still pushes the non-welfare states to conform with or converge to some

features and substance of state welfare of the Western, developed countries. Two, the finding and welfare literature tend to suggest that the welfare states and non-welfare states converge to each other in the use of non-state sector, a form of privatization, in delivering welfare services. Of course, the state still assumes the role of financing or budget subsidization to the non-state sector, as well as the role of service arranger and regulator, ensuring the existence, adequacy, and quality of social welfare services.



สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย


## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	vii
Introduction .....	1
The controversy of welfare and social welfare policy .....	1
Minimal social welfare policy of the minimalist state .....	4
State intervention .....	5
Minimalist state or state intervention .....	10
Social welfare policy in welfare states and non-welfare states .....	11
Survey of related literature .....	13
Research methodology and procedure .....	26
Objective 1 .....	26
Procedure 1 .....	26
Hypothesis 1 .....	26
Data analysis 1 .....	28
Objective 2 .....	30
Hypothesis 2 .....	30
Procedure 2 .....	30
Survey instrument .....	31
Questionnaire analyses .....	37
Result .....	39
Objective 1 .....	39
Hypothesis 1 .....	39
Objective 2 .....	51
Hypothesis2 .....	51
Discussion .....	60
New Convergence Thesis .....	65
Conclusion .....	83
Suggestion for further work .....	88



## (Table of Contents continued)

References .....	89
Appendix .....	95



### List of Tables

## Table

1	Variables and their operational definitions in relation to the framework .....	28
2	Questionnaire items, responses options, and rationales behind the items ..	32
3	Summary of questionnaire items in relation to the framework .....	37
4	Regression coefficients, R, and $R^2$ for dependent measures of equality and social well-being .....	39
5	Result of one-way ANOVAs, with Religion as independent variable and equality and social well-being indicators as dependent variables .....	40
6	Tukey post hoc analyses among three religions, with respect to dependent measures of social well-being .....	41
7	Regression coefficients, R, and $R^2$ , with education policy as the only policy variable for dependent measures of equality and social well-being .....	43
8	Regression coefficients, R, and $R^2$ , with health policy as the only policy variable for dependent measures of equality and social well-being .....	44
9	Regression coefficients, R, and $R^2$ for education and health policies as dependent variables .....	46
10	Result of one-way ANOVAs, with Religion as independent variable and policy factors as dependent measures .....	46
11	Tukey post hoc analyses among three religions, with respect to policy Factors as dependent measures .....	47

## (List of Tables continued)

## Table

12	Result of one-way ANOVAs, with Development as independent variable and equality; social well-being indicators; urbanization; as well as political, and policy factors as dependent measures .....	48
13	Tukey post hoc analyses among three levels of development, with respect To equality; social well-being indicators; urbanization; as well as political, Economic, and policy factors as dependent measures .....	50
14	General composition and profile of Thai students survey for Objective 2 ...	52
15	Result of survey on students' attitude and related chi square values .....	52
16	Composite scores of questionnaire items forming separate kinds of students' attitude .....	58
17	Significant results of simple correlation analyses among the scores of students' attitude .....	58
18	Social spending on health, education, and welfare .....	86

สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

## Introduction

The appropriate level of social welfare policy has been debated and fought among politicians of disparate political parties as well as among scholars in philosophy, political science, social work, and economics. The debate and fight will by all means continue into the future, as the issue of social welfare policy in itself is contentious, stimulating different viewpoints depending on culture, socialization, as well as personal attitude and values. With globalization, viewpoints easily travel across boundaries, mostly and usually from the Western, developed countries to the developing ones. As one can properly reason for or against certain degrees of policy, the declaration of those degrees as right and wrong would be foolhardy. The controversy within the issue is also, on a large part, due to the resource constraint, making its relocation necessary from some people or places to others, in order to have social welfare policy. Frequently, the greater the degree of relocation, the greater is the contention, usually from places and people whose resources are taken. Despite the controversy, social welfare policy must have had some merit on a society; otherwise, the welfare states of mostly Western, developed countries should not have existed for some time.

This study aims to examine the effect of social welfare policy on the global scale as well as to study a group of people's attitude toward social welfare policy in Thailand. Prior to describing the study in detail, the stages of the research must be set for arguments to take place. Such arguments are crucial, since they will serve as the defense for the merit within the objectives of this research. Therefore, this paper will start by describing the controversy revolving around the concept of welfare and social welfare policy. Then, it will proceed to survey related literature, providing the background and framework for the study; research procedure; result; in-depth discussion of the results; conclusion; and suggestion for further work.

### **The controversy of welfare and social welfare policy**

Almost all social science disciplines are interested in or have something to say about welfare and social welfare policy. For instance, with politics ingrained in the nature of the issue, political scientists contribute to rather extensive discussion on the



issue. Similarly, social work is directly involved with social welfare, mostly at the stage of its administration, where professionals of social work bring such benefits as social insurance and social assistance to those in need such as the elderly and children (ILO, 1984: 5-7; Friedlander & Apte, 1980: 115-119). However, the debate on the issue of its appropriateness and appropriate amplitude concentrate in philosophy, politics, and economics.

Before turning to discuss the controversy of welfare, it is appropriate to examine its meaning for the purpose of this study. There is an intermingling of this concept with many others – social policy, social welfare policy, and welfare policy. These concepts are so closely related to one another that they are, more or less, one same thing. But in the consideration of social welfare policy, its definitions abound, where many of them emphasize the amplitude and substance of social welfare policy. In most respects, social welfare policy focuses on the provision of resources and services to people. Therefore, in considering it, one would look at functions of myriad programs, such as social security and social assistance, as well as how these programs fare. Or one could look at rules and procedures of these programs (Jansson, 1990: 18-19). According to Titmuss (1987), social welfare policy comprises principles that govern action directed toward given ends or the actions of government in expressing the general will and desired condition of people and society (p. 23-24). Some examples of social welfare policies consist of the following: medical care, benefits in case of invalidity, unemployment, old age, and sickness (ILO, 1984: 27). Johnson (1987), in mentioning the United States as one of the welfare laggards, states that its education policy is an exception, as the system is one of the best in the developed countries (p. 10). Most literature defines welfare as government's expenditure on merit goods and services, whose consumption exceeds the valuation in the private market. Examples generally include health care, education, public safety, and housing (Morgan & LaPlant, 1996: 215; Yu, 1996: 416; Hutchinson & Schumacher, 1995: 4; Roemer, 1999: 250; Tang, 1999: 99). One question usually raised is whether social welfare is the responsibility of government. Most of us tend to perceive it that way, because we tend to see social



welfare policy as having positive social consequences, which is public well-being. Usually, social objective of social well-being is that of the public sector, not the private sector's (Stiglitz, 2000: 5-6). This is one debate that this paper will pursue in-depth later on, which is the question raised at the beginning of the paper – the appropriate level of social welfare. In other words, what should be the appropriate level of government's role in social welfare policy.

Welfare is also linked to the concept of the welfare state, originating in the Western, developed states, where power, politics, and administration are combined to achieve certain goals. These are, first, the guaranteed minimum income of individuals and families; secondly, the care for contingencies, such as sickness, old age, and unemployment; and third, the provision of some standard social services (MacGregor, 1999: 95). Britain, Sweden, and Italy are welfare states that have national health services based on direct provision of services financed almost entirely from general taxation. On most counts, Sweden is usually regarded as a welfare state leader, whereas the U.S. and Japan as laggards. There seems to be a consensus upon the credence of the welfare state of Sweden – paternalism; Christian charity; the long-standing recognition of the economic advantages to be gained from welfare provisions; and most importantly, the tradition of Swedish social democracy. The mixture of these rationales is believed to achieve the philosophically ideal society of liberty, equality, solidarity, democracy, economic efficiency, and personal security (Johnson, 1987: 21-22). Democracy and liberty is associated with the welfare state, as there is presumption that social well-being could liberate people and, at the same time, prepare them for the civic virtues and political participation. On the other hand, the U.S. is usually raised as a reluctant welfare state.

The judgement in the appropriate magnitude of social welfare is by all means oriented to philosophy and morality. What should be the extent and substance of social policy, that would make a society a moral one? Are those extent and substance fair? Does fairness in the level of social welfare policy lead to a just society? Part of social justice stands for a morally defensible distribution of resources, wealth, and benefit in

society, evaluated in terms of, for instance, wage, profit, housing, medical care, and welfare. Social justice partially concerns who gets what and what amount (Heywood, 1994: 235; Musgrave & Musgrave, 1989: 76). Most of the times, who or what determines those is of equal importance.

#### **Minimal social welfare policy of the minimalist state**

Individualistic, Conservative, and the New Right's values, arguing for a minimalist state, constitute one type of fairness and justice. The New Rights believe in the power of individuals and market. Freedom and self-determination should be endorsed, since they will lead to prosperity. Individuals, if left alone, untouched by the state, will act on their own self-interest and increase work and wealth acquisition, leading, in turn, to a prosperous economy. Therefore, the endowment-based criterion of social justice opts for the kind of rights as entitlement to the work one puts down, as well as its consequences (Musgrave & Musgrave, 1989: 76-78). In other words, a person is entitled to what he/she earns, which is in line with the effort he/she invested.

Social Darwinism and capitalism are closely related to the New Right's values, in their adherence to the power of individualism. The idea, undertaken by Herbert Spencer, is coined in the term "survival of the fittest" to describe an endless struggle to survive in the market place (Heywood, 1994: 318). Those individuals unable to survive deserve being forced out of the market and become bankrupt. Therefore, those who are most fit will remain in the market. Conservatives and neo-conservatives pick up the value of individualism and argue for a liberal, free market society, where government has a minimal role in social welfare policy. The Conservative Party and the Republican Party, for example, have the general disposition toward privatization, market incentives, individualistic freedom in the market, and mediocre state's roles. A large extent of government intervention will result in market insufficiency, since the demand and supply in the market will be tampered, hence, deviating from the optimal market operation. State's involvement in social welfare provision will provide a cushioned safety net for its people. But this results in another source of market inefficiency, since individuals are deprived of economic incentives, which are a source of fertilizer or driving force to excel



and, in turn, producing a larger economic pie. In addition, state's involvement is seen as socially damaging, in that it rids individuals of responsibility, independence, sense of self-reliance, leading ultimately to welfare dependency (George & Wilding, 1994: 28-32). Instead, a sense of citizenship's responsibility toward the state is encouraged. Most Neo-conservatives would endorse John F. Kennedy's inaugural address in January 1961, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country." In this sense, a good citizen is an active one, who relies on himself/herself before others and contribute some benefit to the state, instead of waiting for the state's welfare (Heywood, 1994: 161-162).

To sum up, the argument for a minimal state, popular among the Conservatives and the New Rights, is on the grounds of freedom, individual responsibility and duty, self-respect, self-reliance, and economic efficiency. Are these grounds legitimate, leading to a just society? The safest answer should be "perhaps," since the argument sounds reasonable. After all, people's sense of responsibility as well as the economic consequences of social welfare are foreseeable and not far-fetched. This makes social welfare and social justice difficult to ascertain.

#### State intervention

To the opposite of the minimalist state is social intervention by the government – the statist perspective. The associated ideologies would be compassion, equality, and social rights. Egalitarians have long argued for the maximization and equalization of social welfare (Musgrave & Musgrave, 1989: 76-77). Social intervention by way of state's provision is believed to deliver social equality and poverty reduction. With state's responsibility, the intervention in transferring wealth and income from the well-to-do to the less well-off is presumed to help balance the economic wealth of a country by decreasing the prosperity of the former, while increasing that of the latter. As another consequence, the economic status of the less well-off will ameliorate, decreasing, in turn, their level of economic hardship.

The criteria of state intervention are mainly needs-based, deserts-based, and rights-based. The needs-based criterion originates from the interpretation that people

are entitled to different resource distribution, because they are differentiated on descriptive characteristics, such as race, gender, class or caste of origin, kinship, or age (Hurst, 1992: 288). The aged, for instance, have more needs than the younger generations and, hence, should be entitled to more health care service. This is the reason for various health policies and programs, gearing benefit to the elderly, especially after retirement (ILO, 1984: 55-57). The same kind and level of distribution of benefit go to children in the form of education and the invalids in the form of medical expenses and other related social assistance. Deserts-based criterion of justice also operates on the principle of disparate deservingness (Heywood, 1994: 242-243). People differ in desert for resources. When asked, people mostly state that they would be willing to give portions of their income to help the deserving indigent, but not the undeserving ones. The difficulty and contention, however, would be establishing the criteria of deservingness. The basic judgement would be the criterion of "no fault of one's own" (Pereira & Van Ryzin, 1998: 409-410). Specifically, the deserts-based consideration is partially responsible for the American welfare reform or the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, replacing the old AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children with TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families). The touch of deserts-based consideration consists of, for example, placing a limit on the term of welfare benefit to five years and requiring job search immediately upon entry to welfare (Mead, 2002: 218-219; Chanley & Alozie, 2001: 3; Kraft & Furlong, 2004: 268).

The rights-based criterion, on the other hand, stems from the similarity principle. People are entitled to social welfare as of rights, as opposed to the entitlement in line with the effort invested. To be exact, welfare benefit requires societal, material resources. It is the citizens' right to those resources in some forms, usually essential benefit, such as health, education, and other related, basic social services. As long as a person is a citizen of a state, the provision of certain social benefits becomes the state's responsibility. Being applied uniformly to all, this principle is the similarity criterion. A Full Basic Income (FBI), for example, covers all basic needs of residents in



welfare states and is believed to arrive at the minimal development of individuals and societies (Twine, 1994: 163-164; Roebroek, 1993: 114-116). Another example is the 1997 Thai Constitution, whereby certain rights are more boldly stated than the previous ones. Article 42, for instance, entitles the Thais to twelve years of free education, while Article 52 declares citizens' benefit to health services (1997 Thai Constitution; Rapeepan, 2002: 93-94). Specifically, the present government's Thirty-Baht Health Policy provides citizens with a comprehensive benefit, according to rights. The rights-based principle is associated with the idea of social citizenship, emphasizing social rights, in that citizenship is a universal quality enjoyed by all members and, henceforth, declared equal rights and entitlement. Social citizenship is inextricably bound up with the welfare provision and the capacity of state welfare to ensure economic welfare and security (Heywood, 1994: 159-160). The idea of social citizenship differs from that of active citizenship, in that while the former stresses social welfare as rights, the latter stresses individuals' responsibilities and duties of citizens in a state. While social citizenship and social rights gear toward material resources, such as health and education, the political rights are comparatively less related to material resources. These are the rights to participate in politics both directly and indirectly, such as voting and participation in public hearings (Twine, 1994: 104).

While the New Rights and Conservatives value individualism, Democratic Socialists adhere to collectivism. The state is the agency that collectivism is organized, in which case it represents the collective interests of society. The growth of social welfare, inter alia, has been interpreted as the rise of collectivism, regarded as the anti-thesis of individualism (Heywood, 1994: 337-338). The state has made an agreement with citizens or a social contract, in which the authority of the former is accepted, while functioning to the benefit of the latter, such as in the form of social welfare policy. The welfare state and social services promote social integration and equality, as they reach the less well-off, harder-to-reach groups in society. They provide greater opportunities, especially for the less advantaged, to be healthy, employed, and educated, hence,

lessening social disparity, which is a very important aspect of collectivism (George & Wilding, 1994: 82-83).

While freedom, self-worth, and self-reliance are rationales contributing to justice, according to individualists, the collectivists concern collective interest of a society, which could also be argued as rationale for justice. Actions of individuals sometimes have consequences not only on themselves, but also externally on others. Collectivists, therefore, contends that interests cannot be individually upheld, but must be considered as a collective. In the perspective of collectivists, redistribution of resources comprises one leg of justice. For a society to retain its integrity, any of its members cannot be allowed to starve or become destitute. A starving or destitute person could pose danger as well as embarrassment to other members of society (Chatterjee, 2002: 374). Such conditions, up to a certain extent, could lead to desperation and sometimes resentment, leading, in turn, to certain acts, such as theft and corruption, which are harmful to other members of a society. In order to raise morale and justice, resource redistribution, as a collective action, is usually unavoidable. The procedure and system of redistribution, which could be complex and difficult, need to be released as social welfare policy.

Such policy, to a certain extent, will make a society a welfare state. Within a welfare state regime, various degrees of redistribution is possible, resulting in various intensity of welfare state. State's intervention makes welfare not a commodity that is bought and sold in the market, hence, the terminology of decommodification of welfare service. The lowest level of decommodification belongs to the liberal welfare state regime, where social assistance is given through the system of means-test; and the entitlement rules are strict, inflicting welfare recipients with social stigma. Liberal welfare states comprise, for example, the U.S., Canada, and the United Kingdom. The medium decommodification cluster includes, for example, France, Germany, Finland, Italy, and Australia – the corporatist welfare states. The high decommodification, social democratic states, comprising Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Netherlands, Belgium, and Austria, stress universalism and uniformity, where entitlements are based on rights of citizenship or social citizenship (Twine, 1994: 145-146). The categorization of a welfare



state offered by Titmuss (1974) comprises Residual, Industrial Achievement-Performance, and Institutional Redistributive Models, ranging from low to high levels of decommodification, respectively. Within the Residual welfare state, state intervention is placed secondary to private market and family. For the Industrial Achievement-Performance Model, social welfare policy is believed to help support meritocracy, work performance, and productivity. This type of decommodification is related to Marxists' critique of welfare as a tool of capitalism used for exploitative purpose by keeping labor healthy and productive at all times. (George & Wilding, 1994: 102-103). The Institutional Redistributive Model sees social welfare as a major integrated institution, providing universal services outside the market on the principle of need (Titmuss, 1974: 30-31). In a similar vein, welfare states are also classified as Liberal, Christian Democrat, and Social Democrat, ranging from low to high decommodification. The purpose of welfare state is usually for certain degrees of social equality and well-being, which is one dimension of social justice.

Aside from various types of programs where benefits delivered are either universal or specific, gearing toward certain groups, there are other welfare strategies, such as progressive taxation, increase in education service, and minimum wage increase (Roemer, 1999: 65). In the system of progressive taxation, citizens pay tax according to their ability to pay. While the wealthy generally face a higher tax rate than the less wealthy, public services from spending the tax money are uniformed, provided to all. Many services are earmarked toward the disadvantaged (Musgrave & Musgrave, 1989: 228-230). An increase of education service is believed to equip people with tools to help climb the social ladder of economic and social status. Hutchinson and Schumacher (1995) distinguish the Welfarist Approach from the Humanist Approach to social welfare. While the former sees income and wealth represent the best indicator of people's capacity to afford and achieve well-being, the latter focuses more on a deeper concept of human development (Hutchinson & Schumacher, 1995: 247-248). Simply increasing income and wealth is a shallow technique of increasing well-being; but the effect of public spending must be closely monitored to see if certain degrees and types

of human development has been reached. This latter argument is in line with the issue of income and in-kind transfer, in which the former is more materialistic than the latter. The issue of materialism comprises an argument against the welfare state, in that welfare states shower people with various material benefits, adding materialism to society (Roller, 1995: 171; Ringen, 1987: 48-49). In terms of the achievement of social well-being, giving people in-kind benefits ensures the consumption of necessary goods, such as food, housing, transportation, and health care. However, since people cannot make their own consumption choices, the transfer of benefit in-kind is considered paternalistic and has an inefficient consequence in the use of scarce resources (Stiglitz, 2000: 397-402). In any case, public support for in-kind distribution is higher than income transfer.

Redistributive justice, closely related to social welfare policy, is of interest to social scientists. Nozick, as a libertarian influencing the New Right's belief, perceives the possession of one's own talents, capacities, and their consequences as a just state. On the other hand, John Rawls views it necessary to care for the disadvantaged, since they are members of our society. One of Rawls' principles reflecting this belief is that inequality is only justified when it is for the benefit of the least advantaged (Heywood, 1994: 239). Rawls' famous idea of "veil of ignorance" offers a logical consideration of a just distribution, which is social equality. Rawls presumes that people usually cannot foresee their end state. In that position, they will choose an equal over unequal society, since the chance that they are wealthy, talented, and strong are as likely as the chance that they are poor, untalented, and weak (Hurst, 1992: 290). Also, Marx' famous phrase, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," reflects his view of equality as redistributive justice (Musgrave & Musgrave, 1989: 80).

#### **Minimalist state or state intervention**

Should a state be a minimalist or an interventionist? Arguments for both are well-grounded, being articulated on the opposite ends of a spectrum. But in spite of the normative nature of the question, the result from choosing one over the other is rather empirical. Therefore, it is the first objective of this research to examine the effect of



social welfare policy on certain attributes of people and societies on the global scale. These are mainly equality and quality of life, upon which social welfare policy is usually most intended to affect (Rothstein, 1998: 74; Hutchinson & Schumacher, 1995: 246). On the contrary, low quality of life and inequality would be expected from a lesser degree of social intervention with social welfare policy.

The second objective is in conjunction with the first one, in that the research intends to survey a group of Thai people's attitude toward state intervention with social welfare policy. Since both active, social interventionist and the minimalist state could be defended as social justice, people's attitude on this matter is one indicator, as to whether or not there should be a policy change to either more or less social welfare policy. In a consolidated democratic state like Thailand, public policy should, in some degrees, reflect the desire of its people (Yu, 1996: 6; Ramesh, 2000: 7-8; Crone, 1993: 58-59). Specifically, the group of Thai people in the study comprises fourth year undergraduate students and graduate students from middle to upper income families. Students selected are expected to be well-educated, somewhat well-aware of social policy. Their middle to upper socio-economic status is an important condition, since that provides the meaningfulness in assessing their attitude toward resource relocation, which is usually unavoidable in an interventionist state.

#### **Social welfare policy in welfare states and non-welfare states**

Both types of states have state welfare and state intervention, albeit to a different degree. Welfare states recognize and put high value on social rights to welfare services, entitlement of a certain degree of quality of life, social equality, and economic security (Johnson, 1987: 6). Similar to various degrees of welfare state, state intervention in non-welfare states varies; but millions in developing countries suffer from severe and chronic deprivation in various aspects of life. Within these countries which are mostly non-welfare states, unemployment insurance and state pensions rarely cover more than a small minority. Health care, while often subsidized, may be thinly and haphazardly spread. State support for the infirm and disabled is generally insufficient. Education seldom extends beyond primary school. Shortness in level, coverage, and

effectiveness of state provision of social security partially result from resource constraints. The supply of social security is also restricted by the low level of institutional development, hence, incapable of facilitating effective provision of resources to the poor and vulnerable. On the demand side, the role of the public in exerting pressure for social security through social, legal, and political processes is hindered by the relative powerlessness of those in need within developing countries.

The adoption of the welfare system of the Western, developed welfare states among the developing, non-welfare states is partially explained by the Convergence Thesis. The welfare arrangement of a society is determined largely by the stage of technological development it has reached. As societies industrialize, they converge to welfare states, adopting more features and systems of the latter (Johnson, 1987: 25-29; Tang, 1996: 382). Paces of such development and convergence, however, differ from place to place, with most countries adopting only small parts of the whole system of Western, welfare states. Persisted is still the deprivation and low quality of life.

With the set stage and objectives of study, the next chapter reviews related literature, which offers specific framework for the research.



สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย



### Survey of related literature

Aside from general literature reviewed for setting the stage of this study, a more in-depth survey is geared toward providing the framework for the two objectives of this research. In line with the first objective, literature related to possible social policy effects is pursued accordingly.

Li (2000) comparatively examines income distribution in Taiwan and Mexico, as both countries, since 1960s, have rather similar level of economic development. However, the level of income distribution in Taiwan is conspicuously higher than that of Mexico. This research argues that the disparity is due to state's policy and that economic development does not contribute to equal income distribution. Mexico, on the other hand, has policies that are not very conducive to equal income distribution, in that most government's policies are neo-liberal in characteristic, which is non-market intervention. Taiwan had education reform policy and increases the level of its social insurance to cover the majority of population, extends benefits to the aged and the unemployed. By subsidizing labor-intensive export industries, such as textiles, processed food, and electronic assembly, the Taiwanese government managed to absorb labor into the production process. The use of internal savings is promoted, rather than relying on foreign investment. Mexico, however, has a different kind of policy, in that the government, valuing liberalism, tends not to intervene the market and economy. Access to education is unequal, as children dropping out of school are more frequent in lower-class families, while those of the middle and upper class send their children to high-quality private schools, leading to a greater opportunity for career success among the latter. This exacerbates the income disparity. Moreover, the government allocates a large amount of budget to higher education beyond high schools, benefiting solely upper-class families, as more children from upper-class families than those from lower class families attend high schools. Mexico also experienced wage disparity in 1980s, as the wage of skilled labor increased at a faster rate than that of the low-skilled labor. The Mexican government pursues privatization,

deregulation, and trade liberalization policies, resulting in oligopolistic form of market failure. This, in turn, increases the bargaining power of the oligopolies in public policy formulation. As a result, they tend to receive higher benefit from public policy than do some of the smaller and medium enterprises. On the contrary, over ninety-five percent of businesses in Taiwan comprise small and medium enterprises, due to their promotion by the state. For Mexico, one effect of trade liberalization is that the manufacturing of export product use more capital intensive, negatively affecting the level of unemployment. Therefore, Li (2000) concludes the research that different public policies have a large influence on disparate social conditions in the two countries.

Hutchinson and Schumacher (1995) investigate the relationship between functional types of government's activity and welfare. The study finds a positive correlation of government's spending per capita on public and merit goods and human development. Expenditure on merit goods, such as health care and education arises because society determines that it derives benefits from the consumption of such goods and services, that far exceeds their valuation in the private market. The promotion of consumption, henceforth, constitute an appropriate function of government, especially within developing countries where human development should be boosted. Education positively affect the well-being of the poor in such a way that increases their capacity to participate in broad-based development efforts.

Tang (1999) discusses China's transformation to more capitalist orientation. Between 1949 and 1970, the Chinese government adopted a form of social policy which deviated from the neo-liberal approach, committing resources to societal goals like justice, equality, and redistribution. This was the centralized, statist approach, balancing social stability with economic development. The situation has changed since late 1980s, where the development of free market economy became more endorsed. The egalitarian ideal of "everyone eating from the same pot" gave way to the principle of "to each according to his labor" (p. 97), dwindling the welfarist characteristics. With the adoption of market-orientation policy, there has been growing unemployment in cities, urban poverty, a widening gap in income distribution. The



development of free market helps promote the view of social welfare as a commodity. This incidence is believed to be contributed by inadequate government's policy and spending in welfare, health, and education. There is policy bias away from certain groups, especially the disadvantaged, such as women and the disabled. In the Chinese social welfare policy, there has been a growing resemblance to that of Hong Kong and Singapore, as discussed by Yu (1996), Jones (2002), and Midgley & Tang (2002), as there is a growing subordination of social policy to economic policy in all these countries. Perhaps, the Confucian values have been ingrained in these Chinese-populated countries, whereby the responsibility for welfare falls on the family and clan. When family support is inadequate or unavailable, neighbors who are often of the same clan are expected to assist. These Confucian values, then, provided some excuses for these Asian governments to tone down their social policies and spending, although they also have to be cautious of their own stability, viability, and legitimacy. This makes a certain degree of their effort in social welfare spending necessary. But in any case, the discussed literature, especially Tang (1999) makes a note on observable effects of social welfare policy.

Adolino and Blake (2001) relate government's social welfare spending to the policy outcome. Comparison of spending in social policy and health policy in six developed countries – France, Germany, Italy, Japan, U.K., and U.S. – were pursued. In terms of health policy, most countries pursue a mixed approach of both government's involvement and market function of health service provision. The health policy outcome shows that the U.S. has exceptionally worst outcomes on several major indicators, especially infant mortality rate and life expectancy, despite the total high total health spending in both public and private sectors. The lowest infant mortality rate is found in the countries with mandatory health insurance – France, Germany, and Japan. Although the U.S. had a large amount of total spending in health care, the amount of government's spending is the lowest of all the six countries. This contradicts the general belief that the private sector provides efficiency via the operation of the free market (pp. 237-239). In social policy, France, Germany, and Italy tend to have more universalist

policies, with the public assistance model and social insurance model, while Italy, Japan, and the U.K. pursue means-testing measures more frequently. The policy outcome shows the association of lower rate of relative poverty with countries pursuing universalist policies and higher spending in social policy (pp. 271-273).

Hutchinson and Schumacher (1995) also relate government's policy to human development as evidence for developing countries shows. The broad objective of government's spending on public and merit goods is to reallocate society's scarce resources. Human development is enhanced by the government's policy and its spending for two reasons. One, improving economic efficiency and stability will promote economic and income growth, in turn, advancing human development. Two, government's expenditures on public and merit goods address problems that directly affect the well-being of the poor. Government's social intervention in helping the poor through social welfare spending increases the capacity of the poor to participate in broad-based development effort (p. 250). We would expect these expenditures to have a positive impact on human development, unless the inefficiency in government's operation erodes their positive contribution. Public spending on distributive goods consists of expenditure on social services, such as social security and welfare, with the intention to redistribute private income for equity reasons.

Morgan and LaPlant (1996) studied state and local spending on health and hospitals in the U.S. They measure the spending results as output and outcome. Output comprises service capability as reflected in the number of health workers and hospital beds, while the longer-term outcome is illustrated by some specific health quality indices, namely low birth-weight infants, as well as infant and child mortality. The study finds a relationship between spending and output measures, in that states and localities with higher health spending and policy have greater capacity in health services. The study result implies that the policy effectiveness may require factors other than states and localities' budget allocation to health services and hospitals. These factors may include management skills and preventive, as opposed to curative, health service choices.



Although this present study intends to examine the effects of social welfare policy, such effects are believed to be more confirmable, if compared to other factors, which are political, economic, and social factors.

Wickrama and Mulford (1996) studied the independent effect of political democracy on social well-being in the global perspective. The political democracy index comprises fairness of elections, method of executive and legislative selections, freedom of the press, freedom of group opposition, and public approval of government. Social well-being is measured by life expectancy, infant mortality rate, primary school enrollment, and human development index. The study finds significant positive relationship between political democracy and social well-being. This relation is explained by the political implications of democracy, especially the issue of human rights and social liberty. With the emergence of democracy and democratic institutions, many positive consequences follow, such as freer and fairer competition among political parties, government's legitimacy in the set up of the Cabinet, political participation, the representative system of policy making, more viable civil society such as the formation of interest groups and social movement. All these represent political rights and balance of power among political institutions and between state and society. Governments in democratic regimes are not as responsive to the dominant class than in many others, such as authoritative and bureaucratic politics regimes. As a result, they are more accountable to the powerless, subordinate class, and the mass public, while being capable of pursuing policies in a manner more or less autonomous from class and capital. The pluralistic nature of a democratic society, in itself, brings about equality, since groups are formed rather easily. In addition, pressure for policy making in the political system, theoretically, could come from these groups of all social statuses, not just the more dominant groups. Along this line of argument, Crone (1993) argues that only in a broad political regime, such as in consolidated democracy, where many forces check and balance one another, is the state equipped with political capacity to initiate and implement social welfare change. This is usually welfare enhancing, benefiting the lower class, that presently experiences mediocre quality of life. Also, Varshney (2000)



argues that although democracy does not always achieve the best result in poverty alleviation, it usually prevents the worst-case scenarios such as famine.

The economic factor – wealth, income, and economic development – is expected as possibly affecting social well-being. According to Wilensky (2002), economic development and its wealth-inducing correlates are the main explanation for improved health, one indicator of life quality, before modern medicine expanded. Even after the advancement of medical science, most of the decline in mortality and health maintenance, especially among the non-aged, is beyond reach of modern medicine. An increased food supply, due to the economic development meant improved nutrient and increased resistance to infectious diseases. Improved hygiene and safer food and water also reduce exposure to infection. Declining birth rate and increase in child spacing contribute mightily to better living standard, hence, improving public health. Kuznets also postulates the relationship between economic development and income distribution. At the initial stage of industrialization, the distribution of income worsens as the industrial sector expands. Growing inequality, thus, makes the political regime increasingly unstable. As the process of industrialization reaches a mature stage, inequality diminishes and the political system becomes more stable (Minami & Kim, 1999: 13)

With respect to social factors as a condition for social well-being, one factor would be religion. Wuthnow (1994) studied the influence of religiosity upon attitude toward the indigent. The study finds religious people to feel more socially responsible to the poor than do those who are not religious, as church members are significantly more likely to have thought about their responsibility to the poor than non-members. This is due to the moralistic attitude that correlates with religiosity. With this attitude, people would sense the moral wrongfulness if some people, especially the small number of people, would possess a large portion of wealth, which is ultimately the society's scarce resource. Especially if they are in this group, they would also have a sense of guilt. The disparity in wealth, up to a certain extent, is as much moral failure as economic and political failure. This looks as though income and resource distribution is insufficient, as

a small portion of social members are wealthy, whereas a larger portion is deprived of essential resources, which fulfill the social well-being. Wuthnow states that the Americans view materialism as a symbol of evil and greed. What seems to trouble people the most about it is the selfishness it implies.

Tang (1996) studies the Industrial Society Perspective that influences social security and social well-being. Such perspective is based on the convergence thesis, in that as a country develops by way of industrialization, urbanization inevitably emerges, as well. Therefore, social welfare, industrialization, and urbanization are strongly related to one another. Other factors that are also examined alongside urbanization is affluence, age, labor mobilization or working class conflict, and military spending. The military spending is expected to correlate negatively with social security. The study result shows that, as expected, the more urbanized a country becomes, the more inclination toward social security. Age of population also correlates positively with social security. Therefore, the finding confirms the Industrial Society Perspective that together with industrialization comes urbanization, leading to an advanced, modern society. This, in turn, results in a longer life expectancy, needing a greater extent of social welfare spending.

Many studies already discussed and to be discussed measure and study well-being, as a result of social policy. There is a variety of such measure. Wickrama and Mulford (1996) measure well-being as an expected result of political democracy in terms of infant mortality, life expectancy, primary education enrollment, adult literacy, and purchasing power to satisfy needs. These form human development index (HDI), originally developed by the UN (1991). Economic development is measurable by per capita GNP (gross domestic products) (p. 383). Hutchinson and Schumacher (1999) employed the similar measure in studying government's provision of public, merit, and economic goods on human development. Equality and equity, usually perceived as justice, comprise desirable result and are the main purpose of government's redistribution function. Li (2000) also sees income distribution as a contribution to social equality, that can be reflected in many indicators, such as equal opportunity in



schooling; equal access to land as a factor of production, especially in agrarian economies; as well as equal opportunity between the use of capital and labor in the production process. The Gini Index is used by World Development Report of all issues to measure income distribution among individuals and households. Adolino and Blake (2001) also use measures such as infant mortality, life expectancy, and poverty which reflect certain extent of unequal income distribution in order to study the result of health and social policies.

The literature on policy responsiveness from state to society also abounds. Ramesh (2000) studied the promulgation of social security in Indonesia and Thailand. The determination of social security is, to a large part, politics. Ramesh (2000) questions why, in both countries, there has been a bias in social security toward state workers, with superior social security benefits and programs to those of the private sector. In Thailand during the 1950s, both employers and employees in the non-agricultural private sector were mostly Chinese, whereas those employed in the public sector were mostly Thai. During that time, the Thai bureaucrats were perceived as having a higher privilege and social status than the entrepreneurs and employees, with either Chinese ancestors or low status. This makes it politically unnecessary to extend social security programs and benefits to the private sector and its workers (p. 541-542). For Indonesia, Sukarno established and expanded social security programs for the state employees because of the political challenges that his government was facing. With the democratic forces at the front door, he responded by instituting Guided Democracy measures to protect his government from conflicting social and economic pressures. As a result, Sukarno relied increasingly on the bureaucracy and military to remain in office, with the establishment of social programs to win public support. Coming back to the Thai case, Ramesh contends that the situation of social welfare policy changed after the overthrow of military government in 1973 and again after the consolidation of democratic institutions in the late 1980s. Especially after the latter time, political parties started to face growing competition among themselves with more frequent elections. The real necessity emerged for the political parties to devise policies to appeal to voters, while



the authoritative, militaristic regime faded away in the background. Therefore, in both Indonesia and Thailand, the bias of social security toward state employees reflects their political salience; and the increasing responsiveness of social welfare policy to a larger mass is also due to political consideration. And the argument for Asian values and Asian style of welfare provided within families and among friends should not be totally true. Otherwise, policy makers of both countries would not have established generous social security programs for government's employees.

Crone (1993) and Yu (1996) make arguments regarding social welfare policies in Asia along the same line as Ramesh (2000), but with different emphases in their analyses. In discussing political capacity in state intervention in welfare in Southeast Asia, Crone (1993) argues that the initiation of welfare policy reform is bound to occur with a broad democratic regime. Governments in that regime have to adhere to the interest in the well-being of a larger portion of citizens. Elites will have a stronger incentive to struggle and fight among themselves to opt out a more generous welfare policy and spending (pp. 58-59). Yu (1996), in discussing social services in Hong Kong, argues that the government turns to social policy with a primary objective in maintaining its legitimacy. Hong Kong has not been as democratic as some other Asian countries; therefore, in order to maintain the government's legitimacy, one way is for it to fulfill the welfare of its citizens. Therefore, growth and economic development are emphasized ahead of social welfare, generally pushing the latter to be the responsibility of families. The Hong Kong government is considered pragmatic as it always picks the right timing for appeasing the public by improving their economic and social lives. The Governor of Hong Kong in 1973, for instance, addressed to the Legislative Council that education, medical care, housing, and social welfare constitute four pillars of society, hoping that social services could help build a sense of community and greater social integration among Hong Kong citizens (p. 418).

With the consolidation of democracy and its institutions in developing countries and with the globalization force, policy change toward more social welfare policy is eminent. In Thailand, populist policies under the Thaksin administration, such as the

Thirty Baht Health Policy and the Village Fund, are discussed intensely both inside and outside the academic community. Political parties initiate policies as goods to be purchased by voters in the political market in order to maximize votes, while the "old-styled politics" is losing popularity and appropriateness. In order to be responsive to the public, a survey of the public attitude toward social welfare policy might prove to benefit today's party politics and policy. Chanley and Alozie (2001) state that public officials want to be aligned with the interests of constituencies, especially politically powerful ones. In Thailand, as the society has grown more pluralistic, the middle class is expected to grow larger in size. Their attitude as reflected by a group of Thai students on social welfare policy should not be neglected.

The inclination of the public toward government's social welfare is usually pitched against ideas and ideology of welfare. Pereira and Van Ryzin (1998) surveyed New York residents to study their support for state's welfare policy and reforms. Usually, survey on public attitude regarding welfare examines public perception on welfare as justice and fairness. The main thrust of Pereira and Van Ryzin's survey concerns the deservingness of welfare recipients. Some people see welfare as social rights of the poor. Yet, not everybody in poverty deserves welfare offering by the state. In examining the contraction versus expansion of European welfare states, Roller (1995) surveyed public attitude toward government's role in social welfare policy – public responsibility on old age pensions, education, the guarantee of basic income, and the use of progressive tax policy for redistribution purpose. Roller (1995) distinguishes the redistribution by its range and degree. The former refers to the number of policy goals or policy areas for which the government is responsible. The latter is the intensity of government's activity within a policy area. Roller (1995) also examined attitude on the government's role in achieving different kinds of equality. The national minima is the policy goal of poor relief, minimum wage, national pensions, compulsory education. Redistribution in a stricter sense refers to progressive taxation. Comprehensive secondary education is designed to achieve an equal opportunity. Examples of questions in the study's survey are as follows: Should the government be responsible to



provide health care for the sick? Should the government provide more chances for children from poor families to go to university? Should the government provide everyone with a guaranteed basic income? Should the government reduce the differences in income between people with high income and those with low income (p. 169)? The finding shows that the equality of opportunity is strongly supported, while the strict redistribution policies also received support. But the national minima policy of a guaranteed basic income received the lowest support (p. 176).

Heywood (1994) aligns welfare with equality and social justice. Formal equality or equality before the law signifies that everyone is entitled to similar treatment by the law. For example, the U.S. Constitution states that "All men are created equal;" and the Thai 1997 Constitution states that "Males and females are entitled to equal rights." Equal opportunity entitles people with some social resources that provide necessities, such as education and health care. Equal outcome do provides people with social resources; but tries to achieve radical results, in that it aims for people to have equal resources. Also, social welfare based on needs is the reason why certain groups of people such as the elderly, the disabled, and small children are entitled to more resources than some other groups, usually the strong, healthy adults. The idea and ideology of needs, rights, deserts-based welfare and equality of justice makes the transfer of resources unavoidable from the wealthy to the less well-off. Transfer is also possible from the more wealthy areas to the less wealthy, such as from the developed countries to the developing countries, or from the central part of Thailand to the Northeastern part, which is less economically viable, due to the climate and agrarian condition. In Western welfare states, transfer across generation is nowadays usually a common practice, where today's workforce helps pay for the retired generation through a system of inter-generational contract, such as the U.S.' pay-as-you-go social security program (Kraft & Furlong, 2004: 258). This could also be perceived as resources transfer from the more healthy to the less healthy. Such transfer should bring about social solidarity, as too much disparate wealth is not only believed to be unfair, but also possibly causes resentment through the deprivation.



Inequality and social stratification are social science concepts that relate to each other. Social philosophers such as Marx, Weber, and Parson all discuss social stratification (Rothman, 1999: 28-31). Marx believes that capitalism creates the distinction between the bourgeoisie and proletariat, where the latter is subordinate to the former, leading to class consciousness among the proletariat. Weber argues that people with certain kinds of similarities, such as shared interests or sending children to the same school, flock together, forming status groups. A status group attempts to develop mechanisms for maintaining its members' positions within the group. A set of formal and informal exclusionary rules are established; and members of higher status groups selectively interact only with others whom they consider to be their social equals, socializing with them, joining the same organizations, sending their children to the same schools. Outsiders viewed as social inferiors are simultaneously and deliberately excluded from such contacts. In most extreme cases, status groups evolved into castes, when distinctions of social status are maintained by rigid social connections. A more modern explanation of social stratification is offered by Parson, Davis, and Moore – the functionalists (Hurst, 1992: 204-205). Individuals occupy and fulfill different functions in the social system, such as physicians, policemen, shoe makers, and street cleaners. It is inevitable that certain positions are functionally more important than others. The continuation of society requires these important positions to be filled by qualified people, who, therefore, receive higher rewards, due to their talents and the significance of their positions and consequences. With this difference in positions and reward emerge the stratification and, hence, social inequality.

Social welfare is also related to the additional concepts – materialism and altruism. Those who are less materialistic and altruistic tend to pursue good deeds voluntarily. Altruistic people are aware of the consequence of good deeds and feel personally responsible for such good deeds. As a result, they feel the necessity of pro-social behaviors (Sangiampongsa, 1995: 4-6). Post-materialism in welfare states tends to argue for a society where transfer of social resources are made by choice of individuals, not by force of the state, claiming the legitimacy of the social rights and

social citizenship conceptions. Materialist goals have declined in importance since the late 1960s, while post-materialist goals have gained more importance (Roller, 1995: 171; Ringen, 1987: 48).

The above discussion of literature helps provide the framework for this present research. Next chapter will discuss the research methodology and procedure, while summarizing the framework with respect to the literature.



สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

## Research methodology and procedure

This research has two main objectives. This chapter will first discuss each objective in relation to its framework provided by literature summarized in the previous chapter. It will, then, explain research procedure conducted to fulfill each objective.

**Objective 1:** Since there is a high degree of contention in deciding between a minimal state or a state intervention, this research proposes an empirical study on the effect of social welfare policy on popular goals of welfare policy, namely equality and quality of life or social well-being.

**Procedure 1:** In essence, the first objective is to study the effect of social welfare policy. Therefore, the first necessary information is policy. The next essential information is the effect regarding quality of life or well-being. Based on available secondary data source, World Bank (2000/2001) (World Development Report 2000/2001: Attacking Poverty) has such information called development indicators. Therefore, the unit of analysis comprises individual countries, whose information is available. In terms of social welfare policy, World Bank (2000/2001) provides information regarding public expenditure on education in each country, measured as the percentage of GNP (1997), plus subsidies to private education. Public expenditure on health, measured as percentage of GDP (1990-1998), is also available. These two pieces of information, then, become the social welfare policy variables for this research.

In order to see more clearly the social policy effect, such effect is compared to some other factors that might also influence the quality of life. These factors that are identified from the literature reviewed in the previous chapters comprise the political, economic, and social factors, as summarized in Table 1. Table 1 also indicates two other sources that help provide information on the political and social factors – The World Almanac and Book of Facts 2001 and Freedom House ([www.freedomhouse.org](http://www.freedomhouse.org)).

**Hypothesis 1:** From the identified variables, it is expected that the social policy factors relate more strongly with equality and quality of life than do political, economic, and social factors.



Table 1

Variables and their operational definitions in relation to the framework

Variables	Operational definition	Literature providing the framework
Education policy (Education)	Public expenditure on education (% of GNP). High = high spending; Low = low spending.	Li (2000); Hutchinson & Schumacher (1995); Yu (1996); Jones (2002); Adolino & Blake (2001); Morgan & LaPlant (1996).
Health policy (Health)	Public expenditure on health (% of GDP). High = high spending; Low = low spending.	Same.
Politics (Democracy)	Civil liberty & political rights. ▲ High = undemocratic; Low = democratic.	Wickrama & Mulford (1996); Crone (1993); Varshney (2000).
Economics (Wealth)	GNP per capita. High = wealthy; Low = poor.	Wilensky (2002); Minami & Kim (1999).
Social factor / Urbanization (Urban)	Urban population, measured as % of total population. High % = urbanized; Low = rural.	Tang (1996).
Social factor / Religion (Religion)	Main religion / the religion of the largest portion of population (Christian, Muslim, Others).	Wuthnow.
Equality / Income Distribution (Equality)	Gini Index (0 = perfect equality; 100 = perfect inequality).	Wickrama & Mulford (1996); World Bank (2000/2001); Hutchinson & Schumacher (1995); Li (2000); Adolino & Blake (2001).
Life expectancy (Life)	High = long life expectancy; Low = short life expectancy.	Same.
Child mortality (Child)	Mortality before the age of 5, per 1,000 children. High = high child mortality rate; Low = low child mortality rate.	Same.

(Table 1 continued)

Variables	Operational definition	Literature providing the framework
Infant mortality (Infant)	Mortality before the age of 1, per 1,000 infants. High = high infant mortality rate; Low = low infant mortality rate.	Wickrama & Mulford (1996); World Bank (2000/2001); Hutchinson & Schumacher (1995); Li (2000); Adolino & Blake (2001).
Primary school enrollment (Primary)	Net enrollment in primary schools, measured as % of primary school-aged group. High % = large % in school; Low % = small % in school.	Same.
Secondary school enrollment (Secondary)	Net enrollment in secondary schools, measured as % of secondary school-aged group. High % = large % in school; Low % = small % in school.	Same.
Illiteracy (Illiteracy)	% of people age 15 and above who cannot read and write. High % = high illiteracy; Low % = high literacy.	Same.

Note: Information from [www. Freedomhouse.org](http://www.freedomhouse.org) (*Freedom in the World 2002: The Democracy Gap*) for the variable Democracy; *The World Almanac and Book of Facts 2001* for the variable Religion; and World Bank (2000/2001) for other variables in the table.

▲ Democracy is the composite score of two factors: political rights and civil liberty. Political rights are measured on the scale of 1 (most ideal) to 7 (least ideal). Criteria of ideal, favorable political rights (rating of 1) are the following: free and fair elections; the existence of competitive political parties and interest groups; self determination and higher autonomy among citizens; political participation, especially among minority groups; and decentralization. Civil liberties are also measured on the scale of 1 (most ideal) to 7 (least ideal). Ideal civil liberties possess the following conditions: freedom of expression, assembly, association, and religion; well-established system of rule of law; free economic activity; equality of opportunity; and absence of government's corruption. With the summation of political rights and civil liberty into one variable – Democracy – the lowest score or most ideal democracy is 2, while the highest score or least ideal democracy is 14.

**Data analysis 1:** With the specified hypothesis, multiple regression analyses are pursued to test the proposition, as the following regression equations illustrate:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{Equality} \\
 \text{Life} \\
 \text{Child} \\
 \text{Infant} \\
 \text{Primary} \\
 \text{Secondary} \\
 \text{Illiteracy}
 \end{array}
 \left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{l} \text{Equality} \\ \text{Life} \\ \text{Child} \\ \text{Infant} \\ \text{Primary} \\ \text{Secondary} \\ \text{Illiteracy} \end{array}} \right\} = a + b_1 \text{ Education} + b_2 \text{ health} + b_3 \text{ Democracy} + b_4 \text{ Wealth} \\
 + b_5 \text{ Urban} + b_6 \text{ Christ} + b_7 \text{ Islam}$$

The left side of the equations comprises dependent variables, independent variables are on the right side. Since religion is measured categorically, two dummy variables, Christ and Islam, are used for a three-category measure of religion – Christianity, Islam, and other religions. In order to delineate the exact effect of each religion, if any, one-way ANOVAs with post hoc analyses, will be pursued with each dependent variable.

With respect to the effect of non-policy factors – political, economic, and social factors -- most literature, namely Wickrama & Mulford (1996); Crone (1993); Varshney (2000); Wilensky (2002); Minami & Kim (1999); Tang (1996); and Wuthnow (1994) finds their effects on social well-being, while some find their effects on social welfare policy, as well. Therefore, another set of regression analyses is conducted to study the effect of political, economic, and social factors on social welfare policies, as shown in the the following equations:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{Education} \\
 \text{Health}
 \end{array}
 \left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{l} \text{Education} \\ \text{Health} \end{array}} \right\} = a + b_1 \text{ Democracy} + b_2 \text{ Economics} + b_3 \text{ Urban} + b_4 \text{ Christ} \\
 + b_5 \text{ Islam}$$

Again, the left side of regression equation comprises dependent variables, while independent variables are on the right. One-way ANOVAs on each dependent variable



are also pursued to study the effect of religion, as a social factor, on social welfare policy spending.

**Objective 2:** As the first objective expects to see a strong positive policy effect on social well-being, Objective 2 proposes to survey the attitude of some Thai university students regarding social welfare and policy. A reflection of their attitude might be informative for policy makers, if there were to be a change in social welfare policy, which is expected by this research to be the case, given the expectation of high policy effect.

**Hypothesis 2:** Students tend to agree the most with formal equality or similar treatment of the law, since this type of equality sounds logical in a modern society. Their preference of policies that require more of resource relocation or redistribution is expected to dwindle with a greater degree of forced redistribution through government's intervention. Therefore, they would be more inclined to agree with equal opportunity or policies that lead to the provision of necessities in life, such as education, transportation, and health care than equal outcome or policy that aim to achieve radical results or equal resources among people.

**Procedure 2:** A sample of Thai university students in their fourth year undergraduate class (seniors) as well as graduate students in both science and social science majors, with middle class family background or above, are selected from both Thai public and private universities within Bangkok metropolitan area. Since one general reality of social welfare policy is that public spending is necessary and that relocation of resources might be eminent from the more wealthy to the less wealthy. The middle class should have more resources for the transfer purpose than do the lower class. Therefore, the assessment of their perception through a survey, regarding the resource transfer should be meaningful to this research. In addition, this population is highly educated and, therefore, should be more inclined than other population to give some thoughts to the survey, hence, making the study of their attitude meaningful. Moreover, being in the academic environment and not being as busy as people at work places, they should be more inclined to cooperate with the study. With the selection of fourth year students or

above, this research should benefit from their maturity. The following list comprises the universities where the survey took place.

- Chulalongkorn University
- Kasetsart University
- Thammasat University
- Mahidol University
- Srinakharinwirot University (Only Prasarnmitra Campus)
- Silpakorn University (Only Bangkok campus)
- King Mongkut's Institute of Technology Ladkrabang
- King mongkut's Institute of technology Norh Bangkok
- The National Institute of Development Administration
- King Mongkut's Univeristy of Technology Thonburi
- Bangkok University
- Kasem Bundit University
- Mahanakorn University of Technology
- Dhurakijpundit Unviersity
- Krirk University

The sample size is  $N = 302$  by reference of Yamane (1967) with a total of 100,000 fourth year undergraduate students or above. The information for the computation is from Table 6: Total University Students by Institutions and Degrees of Information Technology, Ministry of University Administration, Academic Year 2001. According to Yamane (1967),  $N = 302$  is the sample size for the precision of  $\pm 7$ , at 95 % confidence interval.

**Survey Instrument:** Questionnaire items were generated and pretested with 30 undergraduate and graduate students at Faculty of Political Science, Chulalongkorn University. Corrections and adjustments are made for the purpose of clarity and effectiveness of the instrument. The actual questionnaire used in the field is in the



appendix. Table 2 explains the items along with response options, their meanings, and rationales behind them.

Table 2

Questionnaire items, response options, and rationales behind the items

Item 1: ใครควรช่วยเหลือเด็กกำพร้าก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก

Choices: รัฐ (Pro-social welfare policy / state intervention)

ญาติ (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Social welfare for orphans, as a group of the advantaged.

Item 2: หากต้องเลือก ท่านอยากให้รัฐบาลทำอะไรก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก

Choices: นโยบายสังคม (Pro-social welfare policy)

นโยบายเศรษฐกิจ (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Priority of social welfare policy or economic policy.

Item 3: การช่วยเหลือ เช่นการให้เงิน แก่คนยากจน ควรเป็นลักษณะใด

Choices: เป็นหน้าที่ของประชาชน (Pro-social welfare policy)

เป็นไปตามความสมัครใจของประชาชน (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Mandatory (state intervention) or voluntary resource distribution.

Item 4: อย่างไร ไม่เป็นธรรม มากกว่ากัน

Choices: คนจำนวนมาก มีฐานะยากจน (Pro-social welfare policy)

รัฐเก็บภาษีจำนวนมาก จากผู้มีเงินได้ (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Welfare / equality / egalitarianism or endowment-based criteria as social justice.

Item 5: หากรัฐบาล จะเก็บภาษีเพิ่มจากท่าน เมื่อท่านมีรายได้ แล้วนำมาช่วยคนพิการให้มากขึ้น ท่านคิดอย่างไร

Choices: เห็นด้วย (Pro-social welfare policy)

ไม่เห็นด้วย (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: For or against progressive relocation of resources through state intervention toward the disabled, as the disadvantaged.

(Table 2 continued)

Item 6: ท่านเห็นเด็กชายพวงมาลัยบนท้องถนน ท่านคิดอย่างไรก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก

Choices: ท่านคิดว่ารัฐควรช่วยเหลือ (Pro-social welfare policy)

ท่านรู้สึกอยากช่วยซื้อพวงมาลัย (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: State intervention to ameliorate poverty in children or non-intervention.

Item 7: หากต้องเลือก ท่านเลือกสิ่งใดก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก

Choices: ความเท่าเทียมของฐานะทางเศรษฐกิจของประชาชน (Pro-social welfare policy)

เสรีภาพของประชาชน (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Priority of social equality or freedom.

Item 8: เมื่อเกิดอุบัติเหตุบนถนน ท่านอยากเห็นสิ่งใดก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก

Choices: เจ้าหน้าที่ของโรงพยาบาลของรัฐ (Pro-social welfare policy)

เจ้าหน้าที่อาสาสมัครของมูลนิธิต่าง ๆ (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Selection between public service / state intervention or private service.

Item 9: เมื่อมีการหย่าร้าง ท่านคิดว่าอย่างไรเหมาะสมกว่ากัน

Choices: การจ่ายค่าเลี้ยงดูบุตร เป็นหน้าที่ตามกฎหมาย (Pro-social welfare policy)

การจ่ายค่าเลี้ยงดูบุตร เป็นไปตามความสมัครใจ (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: State's enforcement of child support to prevent poverty in children or non-intervention.

Item 10: ท่านคิดอย่างไร กับการที่ผู้มีรายได้น้อย ได้รับสิทธิประโยชน์ในสังคม เช่นการศึกษา หรือ  
สาธารณสุข มากกว่าผู้มีรายได้สูง

Choices: ยุติธรรม (Pro-social welfare policy)

ไม่ยุติธรรม (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Selection between equality through state intervention or non-intervention

Item 11: อย่างไร ยุติธรรม มากกว่ากัน

Choices: ผู้มีรายได้มาก แบ่งปันเงินแก่ผู้มีรายได้น้อย (Pro-social welfare policy)

ผู้ที่ทำงานหนัก มีรายได้สูง (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Egalitarian criterion or endowment-based criterion.



(Table 2 continued)

Item 12: ท่านคิดอย่างไร กับการที่รัฐเก็บภาษีที่บ่งชี้ความมั่งมี เช่นภาษีมรดก หรือภาษีที่ดิน ในอัตราสูง ๆ แล้วนำภาษีนั้น มากระจายให้ผู้มีรายได้น้อย

Choices: ยุติธรรม (Pro-social welfare policy)

ไม่ยุติธรรม (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Egalitarianism as social justice through resource relocation by the state.

Item 13: หากญาติสนิทของท่านชราภาพ และต้องการการดูแลจากท่าน ท่านคงรู้สึก

Choices: ยินดี แต่อาจไม่ค่อยสะดวก เพราะท่านคงมีภาระหน้าที่อื่นด้วย

(Pro-social welfare policy)

ยินดี และจะดูแลแน่ (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Inclination to demand state welfare or acceptance of Asian-styled welfare provided within family.

Item 14: เมื่อมีรายได้ ท่านยินดีจ่ายภาษี เป็นกึ่งเปอร์เซ็นต์ของรายได้ของท่าน เพื่อให้รัฐนำไปช่วยคนจน

Indication of %: High % = Pro-social welfare policy

Low % = Not pro-social welfare policy

Rationale: Progressive relocation of resources through state intervention toward the indigent, as the disadvantaged.

Item 15: ท่านเห็นด้วยกับอย่างใดมากกว่ากัน

Choices: ความแตกต่างของฐานะ ระหว่างคนจน-คนรวย แสดงถึงความบกพร่องของสังคม

(Pro-social welfare policy)

ความแตกต่างของฐานะ ระหว่างคนจน-คนรวย เป็นเรื่องธรรมดาของสังคม

(Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Attitude toward equality.

Item 16: หากท่านสามารถเลือกได้ ท่านจะเลือกไปใช้บริการที่ใด เป็นอันดับแรก

Choices: โรงพยาบาลของรัฐ (Pro-social welfare policy)

โรงพยาบาลเอกชน (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Selection between public service / state intervention and private service / non-intervention.

(Table 2 continued)

Item 17: หากรัฐบาล จะเก็บภาษีเพิ่มจากท่าน เมื่อท่านมีรายได้ เพื่อนำมาพัฒนาคุณภาพบริการ  
ขนส่งสาธารณะ เช่นรถประจำทาง รถไฟฟ้า รถไฟ ท่านคิดอย่างไร

Choices: เห็นด้วย (Pro-social welfare policy)

ไม่เห็นด้วย (Not pro-social welfare policy)

Rationale: Attitude toward public utilities as public service / state intervention.

Item 18: ท่านคิดอย่างไร: ประชาชนไทย ควรได้รับการปฏิบัติโดยกฎหมายเสมอเหมือนกัน

Choices: เห็นด้วย (Pro-equality before the law)

เฉย ๆ (Neutral)

ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย (Not pro-equality before the law)

Rationale: Attitude toward equality before the law.

Item 19: ท่านคิดอย่างไร: ประชาชนไทย ควรได้รับบริการด้านการศึกษาฟรีจากรัฐ จนถึงชั้นมัธยม  
หรือเทียบเท่า เสมอเหมือนกัน

Choices: เห็นด้วย (Pro-equal opportunity)

เฉย ๆ (Neutral)

ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย (Not pro-equal opportunity)

Rationale: Attitude toward equal opportunity.

Item 20: ท่านคิดอย่างไร: ประชาชนไทย ควรได้รับแบ่งทรัพยากรในสังคม เช่นทรัพย์สิน ความ  
มั่งคั่ง และรายได้ อย่างเท่าเทียมกัน

Choices: เห็นด้วย (Pro-equal outcome)

เฉย ๆ (Neutral)

ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย (Not pro-equal outcome)

Rationale: Attitude toward equal outcome.

Item 21: หากต้องเลือก ท่านเลือกอย่างใดก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก

Choices: งานที่ชอบ (Non-materialist)

งานที่ได้เงินดี (Materialist)

Rationale: Respondent as non-materialist or materialist.



(Table 2 continued)

---

Item 22: หากต้องเลือก ท่านจะเลือกร่วมทำงานกับใครก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก

Choices: คนที่มีชื่อเสียงในสังคม (Materialist)

คนดี (Non-materialist)

Rationale: Respondent as materialist or non-materialist.

---

Item 23: ท่านคิดอย่างไร: เงิน เป็นที่มาของความสุขได้มาก

Choices: เห็นด้วย (Materialist)

ไม่เห็นด้วย (Non-materialist)

Rationale: Respondent as materialist or non-materialist.

---

Item 24: ท่านมักจะเลือกอยู่ในกลุ่มคนที่มีสถานภาพทางสังคม-เศรษฐกิจใกล้เคียงกับท่าน

Choices: ใช่ (Stratification)

ไม่ใช่ (Non-stratification)

Rationale: Inclination toward social stratification or non-stratification.

---

Item 25: ในสังคมนรอบ ๆ ตัวท่าน คนที่มีสถานภาพทางสังคม-เศรษฐกิจใกล้เคียงกัน มักรวมกลุ่ม  
อยู่ด้วยกัน

Choices: คิดว่าจริง (Stratification)

ไม่น่าจะจริง (Non-stratification)

Rationale: Perception of social stratification or non-stratification.

---

Item 26: คนจนมักเสียเปรียบคนรวย

Choices: เห็นด้วย (Stratification)

ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย (Non-stratification)

Rationale: Perception of social stratification or non-stratification.

---

Item 27: ท่านบริจาคเงิน-สิ่งของบ่อยแค่ไหน

Choices: บ่อย (Altruistic)

ไม่ค่อยบ่อย (Not altruistic)

Rationale: Respondent as altruistic or not altruistic.

---

(Table 2 continued)

Item 28: ท่านทำงานอาสาสมัคร บ่อยแค่ไหน

Choices: บ่อย (Altruistic)

ไม่ค่อยบ่อย (Not altruistic)

Rationale: Respondent as altruistic or not altruistic.

Item 29: ท่านประกอบกิจกรรมทางศาสนา บ่อยแค่ไหน

Choices: บ่อย (Altruistic)

ไม่ค่อยบ่อย (Not altruistic)

Rationale: Respondent as religious and, hence, altruistic or not religious, not altruistic.

Table 3 summarizes all the questionnaire items in relation to the framework provided by the review of related literature.

Table 3

Summary of questionnaire items in relation to the framework

Items	Attitude / perception of interest	Literature providing framework of items
1-17	Pro-social welfare policy / state intervention; Or not pro-social welfare policy	Pereira & Van Ryzin (1998); Roller (1995); Heywood (1994); Thai 1997 Constitution; Kraft & Furlong (2004)
18-20	Pro-equality before the law, equal opportunity, And equal outcome or not pro-equality	Heywood (1994); Roller (1995); Thai 1997 Constitution
21-23	Materialist or non-materialist	Roller (1995); Ringen (1987)
24-26	Perception of society as stratified or not stratified	Rothman (1999); Hurst (1992)
27-29	Altruistic or not altruistic	Schwartz (1970, 1973)

Questionnaire analyses: All the questionnaire items have two or three response options, making their measurement categorical in nature. Non-parametric, chi square tests ( $\chi^2$ )



are pursued to delineate the proportion of those pro-state intervention from those not pro-state intervention, of materialists from non-materialists, of those perceiving social stratification from those perceiving non-stratification, and of altruistic students from non-altruistic ones. The same chi square analyses are pursued to distinguish students who are pro-equality of each type from those who are not. The chi square values along with their associated indicator of statistical significance (p-values) show which types of equality are more accepted than others.

Composite scores of the questionnaire items are formed by summation of sets of items into separate kinds of attitude. These are for possible use in simple correlation analyses. Items 1 to 13 and 15 to 17 are combined to form attitude toward social welfare policy. Item 14, by itself, represents attitude toward progressive taxation. Items 18 to 20 are combined to become attitude toward social equality. Items 21 to 23 are summed as materialistic attitude. Items 24 to 26 form the perception of social stratification. And Items 27 to 29 become altruistic attitude.

This chapter has discussed the research procedure, using the reviewed literature as framework. Next chapter turns to the illustrate findings.



สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

## Result

The research progresses according to the procedure discussed in the last chapter, in response to the two objectives.

**Objective 1:** The main thrust of the first objective is to study the effect of social welfare policy on social well-being and equality by comparing such effect with that of political, economic, and social factors.

**Hypothesis 1:** Social welfare policy is expected to be more capable of determining social well-being than political, economic, and social factors

In response to Objective 1 and Hypothesis 1, multiple regression analyses are conducted. Table 4 shows regression coefficient of each equation, as well as the test of significance of independent variables. Religion adds to the explanation of dependent variables when  $F_{2,109} > 3.07$  at the .05 level (Harnett & Murphy, 1985: 659).

Table 4

Regression coefficients, R, and R<sup>2</sup> for dependent measures of equality and social well-being

Independent Variables	Regression coefficients for each dependent variable						
	Gini	Life	Child	Infant	Primary	Secondary	Illiteracy
Constant	48.25	50.30	178.85	110.95	59.92	19.66	62.71
Education	.28	-.08	- 1.96	- 1.16	1.12	3.22**	- 1.29 <sup>as</sup>
Health	- 1.84**	1.20*	- 7.28*	- 4.57**	1.51	1.76	- 2.41*
Democracy	- .37	- .40	.30	.37	.30	- .45	- .50
Wealth <sup>▲</sup>	- .00**	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00**	.00
Urban	.02	.29**	- 1.78 **	- 1.00**	.28**	.48**	- .46**
Christ <sup>▲</sup>	1.64	- 2.20	8.21	2.65	- .29	- 1.64	- 5.67
Islam <sup>▲</sup>	- 1.68	- 1.90	18.95	7.44	- 11.46*	- 7.49	12.57
R	.47	.80	.75	.79	.62	.78	.78
R <sup>2</sup>	.22	.63	.57	.63	.38	.61	.61

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01

<sup>as</sup> = approaching significance (p < .10)



(Table 4 continued)

♣ Christ and Islam, indicating religion as a social factor, comprise dummy variables, due to their categorical measurement. For each dependent variable, two blocks of variables are entered into the regression equation. One block consists of qualitative independent variables (Christ and Islam); and another block consists of all independent variables, both qualitative and quantitative. The ability of religion, as a social factor, in explaining each dependent variable is computed by

$$F_{(J, n - m - 1)} = \frac{(SSEs - SSE) / J}{SSE / (n - m - 1)}, \text{ where}$$

SSEs = Sum of squares (residuals) of the shorter regression model of independent variables (excluding dummies);

SSE = Sum of squares (residuals) of the full regression model of independent variables (both quantitative and dummy variables);

J = Number of dummies;

m = Total independent variables in the complete regression model.

♣ Regression coefficients for Wealth as independent variable are all very small numbers, e.g., -.00033 for Gini.

It turns out that religion contributes to the explanation of primary school enrollment and illiteracy (respectively,  $F_{2, 109} = 3.98$  and  $10.10 > F_{2, 109} = 3.07$  at the .05 level). Results of one-way ANOVA on Religion as independent variable, however, reveal significance with respect to all dependent variables, but Gini. These results are shown in Table 5, along with the follow up test for group effects in Table 6

Table 5

Result of one-way ANOVAs, with Religion as independent variable and equality and social well-being indicators as dependent variables

Scale	SS	df	MS	F
Gini				
Between groups	33.75	2	16.88	.16 <sup>ns</sup>
Within groups	12,259.25	114	107.54	

(Table 5 continued)

Scale	SS	df	MS	F
Life expectancy				
Between groups	1,902.30	2	151.15	8.00 **
Within groups	13,547.13	114	118.83	
Child mortality				
Between groups	71,103.77	2	35,551.88	8.96 **
Within groups	452,219.43	114	3,966.84	
Infant mortality				
Between groups	26,904.74	2	13,452.37	10.25 **
Within groups	149,594.19	114	1,312.23	
Primary school enrollment				
Between groups	7,487.39	2	3,743.70	12.14 **
Within groups	35,157.69	114	308.40	
Secondary school enrollment				
Between groups	14,976.36	2	7,488.18	11.57 **
Within groups	73,788.28	114	647.27	
Illiteracy				
Between groups	18,463.90	2	9,231.95	26.09 **
Within groups	40,342.38	114	353.88	

\*\*  $p < .01$       <sup>ns</sup> = non-significance

Table 6

Tukey post hoc analyses among three religions, with respect to dependent measures of social well-being

Dependent variables	Religions (Independent variables)		
	Group 1 = Christian	Group 2 = Others	Group 3 = Muslim
	N = 69	23	25
Life expectancy:	$\bar{X}$ = 68.88	62.72	59.38

(Table 6 continued)

Dependent variables	Religions (Independent variables)		
	Group 1 = Christian	Group 2 = Others	Group 3 = Muslim
	N = 69	23	25
Child mortality:	$\bar{X} = 42.65$	80.35	100.76
Infant mortality:	$\bar{X} = 29.30$	54.52	64.08
Primary:	$\bar{X} = 91.06$	83.04	71.04
Secondary:	$\bar{X} = 72.30$	56.91	44.92
Illiteracy:	$\bar{X} = 10.30$	28.24	40.42

Note: Groups connected to each other by the same line do not significantly differ from each other at the .05 level.

Table 4 reflects some patterns of result. The coefficients of multiple correlation,  $R$ , are rather high on most dependent variables, except Gini. A large portion of their variation can be explained by independent variables in each equation. Particularly, almost 70 percent of life expectancy and infant mortality are explained by the equation. A closer look at the explanatory power of each independent variable reveals that health policy factor is a significant variable in almost all regression equations, except education-related variables – primary and secondary school enrollment. The same can be said for urbanization as a social factor. Education policy variable does not fare well in the equations, although it is somewhat more powerful than the economic, political, as well as social (Religion) factors. Algebraic signs, especially for significant independent variables are all in the correct, reasonable direction. For instance, the higher health spending is, the less infant and child mortality rates are. The higher spending on education is, the more secondary school enrollment and the less illiteracy rate are. The



Industrial Society Perspective (Tang, 1996), is also quite true, as Table 4 shows a high relationship between urbanization and social well-being.

Tables 5 and 6 also show interesting patterns. Religion, as a social factor, if considered alone, contributes to a variation in most indicators of social well-being, except income distribution (Gini). Another noticeable pattern is the order of all indicators of life quality, with respect to different religions, ranging from best quality for Christian countries to lowest quality for Islamic countries. Also, Islamic countries and other non-Christian countries fare equally in the quality of life.

Table 7

Regression coefficients, R, and R<sup>2</sup>, with education policy as the only policy variable for dependent measures of equality and social well-being

Independent variables	Regression coefficients for each dependent variable						
	Gini	Life	Child	Infant	Primary	Secondary	Illiteracy
Constant	45.68	51.98	168.67	104.57	62.03	22.13	59.35
Education	-.22	.24	-3.92 <sup>as</sup>	-2.39*	1.52*	3.69**	-1.44**
Democracy	-.13	-.55	1.24	.96	.10	-.68	-.19
Wealth <sup>‡</sup>	-.00**	.00	-.00	-.00	.00	.00*	-.00
Urban	-.00	.30**	-1.85**	-1.05**	.30**	.50**	-.49**
Christ <sup>▲</sup>	-.11	-1.06	1.27	-1.69	1.15	.04	-7.97*
Islam <sup>▲</sup>	-2.46	-1.38	15.84	5.49	-10.82*	-6.73	11.54
R	.40	.79	.74	.78	.61	.78	.77
R <sup>2</sup>	.16	.62	.55	.60	.37	.61	.59

\* p < .05      \*\* p < .01      <sup>as</sup> = approaching significance (p < .10)

▲ Explanatory power of Christ and Islam as dummy variables for the religion factor is computed by

$$F_{(j, n-m-1)} = \frac{(SSEs - SSE) / j}{SSE / (n - m - 1)}$$

‡ Regression coefficients for Wealth as independent variable are all very small numbers, e.g.,  
- .000464 for Gini.

Table 8

Regression coefficients, R, and R<sup>2</sup>, with health policy as the only policy variable for dependent measures of equality and social well-being

Independent variables	Regression coefficients for each dependent variable						
	Gini	Life	Child	Infant	Primary	Secondary	Illiteracy
Constant	49.04	50.07	173.30	107.66	63.08	28.77	59.06
Health	- 1.70**	1.16*	- 8.25**	- 5.14**	2.06*	3.36**	- 3.05**
Democracy	- .37	- .40	.31	.37	.30	- .46	- .50
Wealth <sup>♣</sup>	- .00**	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00*	.00
Urban	.02	.29**	- 1.79**	- 1.02**	.29**	.50**	- .47**
Christ <sup>♠</sup>	1.61	- 2.20	8.37	2.75	- .38	- 1.91	- 5.57
Islam <sup>♠</sup>	- 1.77	- 1.87	19.57	7.81	- 11.82*	- 8.50	12.98
R	.46	.80	.75	.79	.61	.75	.77
R <sup>2</sup>	.21	.64	.57	.62	.37	.57	.60

\* p < .05      \*\* p < .01

♠ Explanatory power of Christ and Islam as dummy variables for the religion factor is computed by

$$F(J, n - m - 1) = \frac{(SSEs - SSE) / J}{SSE / (n - m - 1)}$$

♣ Regression coefficients for Wealth as independent variable are all very small numbers, e.g., - .00033 for Gini.

Health and education are different types of policy, possibly bound to have different effects on social well-being. Therefore, as some further analyses, education and health policies, as independent variables, are analyzed separately in different regression equations for each dependent variable, as illustrated in Tables 7 and 8. When either health or education policy is put into each regression equation, as the only policy factor, analyses show that the amount of variation in dependent variables can, more or less, be equally explained as in regression models with both policy factors, indicated in Table 4. This tends to suggest that each individual policy factor is quite powerful in itself in explaining dependent variables. In particular, although Table 4 shows that education policy is somewhat less able than the health policy factor to



explain dependent variables, Table 7 shows its increasing power, if delineated from the health policy factor. Its significance is found in most dependent variables, as opposed to rather few in equations with both policy factors. The similar result is found in Table 8, with health as the only policy factor. It is highly significant in determining positive quality of life, as well as income distribution and school enrollment, despite the latter's more relation to education policy factor. Similar to Table 4, urbanization is a very powerful factor in explaining the positive quality of life, hence, well supporting the Industrial Society Perspective (Tang, 1996). Surprisingly, Tables 4, 7, and 8 all reveal mediocre contribution of political and wealth factors to the explanation of quality of life. One should find it logical to expect the wealth factor, in particular, to provide a substantial contribution to the regression equations.

This latter, surprising result turns this research to further analyses. Some literature, such as Wilensky (2002) and Minami and Kim (1999) discusses the effect of political, economic, and social factors on social welfare policy, which could be an intermediate effect, prior to social well-being as the final outcome. Such intermediate effect is worth exploring, to see whether or not politics and wealth, in particular, influence social welfare policy in a greater extent than the final outcome of social well-being. Further multiple regression analyses, then, proceeds with health and education policies, each as separate dependent variables; and political, wealth, and social factors as independent variables. Table 9 summarizes the result.

From Table 9, Religion adds explanation to health policy factor ( $F_{2,111} = 4.16 > F_{2,111} = 3.07$  at the .05 level). One-way ANOVAs on religion with education and health spending as dependent variables, along with follow-up analyses are pursued as illustrated in Tables 10 and 11. With religion as a social factor, health policy varies in a greater extent than in education policy, resulting in a higher significance, as well as between group differences, indicated in Tukey post hoc analysis. Christian countries, again, fare the highest, while Islamic countries fare the lowest, with other countries in the middle, in terms of the extent of policies. With respect to multiple regression analyses, shown in Table 9, both wealth and the extent of democracy affect the strength of health



policy spending, while urbanization provides no explanatory effect. For education policy, no factor leads to its determination, which deserves further explanation. From the analyses thus far, urbanization has a stronger effect in the final outcome or social well-being, while leaving negligible impact on the policy determination.

Table 9

Regression coefficients, R, and R<sup>2</sup> for education and health policies as dependent variables

Dependent Variables	Regression coefficients for each dependent variable						R	R <sup>2</sup>
	Constant	Democracy	Wealth <sup>▲</sup>	Urban	Christ <sup>▲</sup>	Islam <sup>▲</sup>		
Education	4.07	- .08	.00	.01	.45	- .12	.36	.13
Health	2.49	- .15**	.00**	.01	1.07**	.39	.73	.54

\*\* p < .01

▲ Explanatory power of Christ and Islam as dummy variables for the religion factor is computed by

$$F_{(j, n-m-1)} = \frac{(SSEs - SSE) / J}{SSE / (n - m - 1)}$$

▲ Very small regression coefficients.

Table 10

Result of one-way ANOVAs, with Religion as independent variable and policy factors as dependent measures

Scale	SS	df	MS	F
Education				
Between groups	34.48	2	17.24	4.15 *
Within groups	473.37	114	4.15	
Health				
Between groups	117.83	2	58.91	16.83 **
Within groups	399.15	114	3.50	

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01

Table 11

Tukey post hoc analyses among three religions, with respect to policy factors as dependent measures

Dependent variables	Religions (Independent variables)		
	Group 1 = Christian	Group 2 = Others	Group 3 = Muslim
N =	69	23	25
Education: $\bar{X}$ =	4.99	4.10	3.74
Health: $\bar{X}$ =	4.20	2.31	2.04

Note: Groups connected to each other by the same line do not significantly differ from each other at the .05 level.

Since politics and wealth are much less powerful than social welfare policy and urbanization in determining social well-being, simple correlational analyses are pursued to explore paired relationships. The results indicate many high Pearson Correlations ( $r$ s), such as  $r_{\text{Democracy, Child}} = .47, p < .01$ ;  $r_{\text{Democracy, Life}} = -.55, p < .01$ ;  $r_{\text{Wealth, Gini}} = -.38, p < .01$ ; and  $r_{\text{Wealth, Second}} = .59, p < .01$ . In overall, high level of democracy is associated with low child and infant mortality, low illiteracy rate, long life expectancy, and high level of primary and secondary school enrollment. The wealth factor is related to low infant and child mortality; more equality in income distribution; low illiteracy rate; long life expectancy; and high level of primary and secondary school enrollment.

Since the unit of analysis for the first objective comprises all countries whose data are available, the final analyses are the effect of development factor on all quantitative variables – social welfare policies, equality, quality of life, as well as political, economic, and social factors. The World Bank (2000/2001) classifies countries into three levels of development: low-income, middle income, and high-income economies, ranging from low to high level of development, which is closest to the known notion of developed and developing countries. With the available information on many social

indicators such as social well-being, level of democracy, wealth, and the effect of social policies, the result of one-way ANOVAs on all these variables reveals whether or not positive conditions, especially the quality of life, are ultimately associated with the level of development. Tables 12 and 13 summarize the result. Table 12 shows significant effects on all variables, with very large F values, except Gini and education spending. This reflects the lowest association of level of development and income distribution and of level of development and education spending among the countries in the study. Group differentiation with respect to each dependent variable, shown in Table 13, in support of one-way ANOVAs, reveals great distinctions between groups, indicating the relation between positive quality of life and the levels of development. The higher is the level of development, the better is the quality of life.

Table 12

Result of one-way ANOVAs, with Development as independent variable and equality: social well-being indicators: urbanization: as well as political, economic, and policy factors as dependent measures

Scale	SS	df	MS	F
<b>Gini</b>				
Between groups	1,834.68	2	917.34	10.00 **
Within groups	10,458.31	114	91.74	
<b>Life expectancy</b>				
Between groups	9,680.23	2	4,840.11	95.64 **
Within groups	5,769.20	114	50.61	
<b>Child mortality</b>				
Between groups	292,642.84	2	146,321.40	72.31 **
Within groups	230,680.36	114	2,023.51	
<b>Infant mortality</b>				
Between groups	104,696.88	2	52,348.44	83.11 **
Within groups	71,802.05	114	629.84	



(Table 12 continued)

Scale	SS	df	MS	F
Primary school enrollment				
Between groups	19,787.60	2	9,873.80	49.35 **
Within groups	22,857.48	114	200.50	
Secondary school enrollment				
Between groups	46,802.18	2	23,401.09	63.57 **
Within groups	41,962.45	114	368.09	
Illiteracy				
Between groups	26,248.51	2	13,124.25	45.95 **
Within groups	32,557.78	114	285.60	
Democracy				
Between groups	568.71	2	284.35	39.33 **
Within groups	824.18	114	7.23	
Wealth				
Between groups	8,950,000,000	2	450,000,000	350.76 **
Within groups	1,450,000,000	114	13,000,000	
Urbanization				
Between groups	32,097.46	2	16,048.73	65.96 **
Within groups	27,736.24	114	243.30	
Education				
Between groups	54.55	2	77.78	6.86 **
Within groups	453.30	114	3.98	
Health				
Between groups	237.83	2	118.92	48.56 **
Within groups	279.15	114	2.45	

\*\* p &lt; .01

Table 13

Tukey post hoc analyses among three levels of development, with respect to equality; social well-being indicators; urbanization; as well as political, economic, and policy factors as dependent measures

	Levels of development		
	Group 2 = Middle	Group 1 = Low	Group 3 = High
Gini:	N = 48	44	25
	$\bar{X}$ = 42.88	42.48	33.04
Life expectancy:	Group 1 = Low	Group 2 = Middle	Group 3 = High
	N = 44	48	25
	$\bar{X}$ = 54.66	69.36	77.82
Child mortality:	$\bar{X}$ = 125.50	33.96	6.32
Infant mortality:	$\bar{X}$ = 78.77	26.77	5.08
Primary:	$\bar{X}$ = 68.70	93.10	99.08
Secondary:	$\bar{X}$ = 40.36	69.19	92.96
Illiteracy:	$\bar{X}$ = 38.88	12.66	2.12
Wealth	$\bar{X}$ = 366.36	2,607.08	22,737.00
Urban	$\bar{X}$ = 34.93	59.90	78.04
Education	$\bar{X}$ = 3.76	4.74	5.56

(Table 13 continued)

	Levels of development		
	Group 1 = Low	Group 2 = Middle	Group 3 = High
	N = 44	48	25
Health	$\bar{X}$ = 1.98	3.35	5.84

Note: Groups connected to each other by the same line do not significantly differ from each other at the .05 level

The results of all the above analyses, with multiple regression analyses, in particular, lead to the final note for the first research objective in exploring the social welfare policy effect on social well-being. Both education and health policies, with the latter in particular, contribute a great deal to quality of life, as well as income distribution. Their separation in the analyses heightens the education policy effect, well supporting the hypothesis of strong policy effect. The very last two analyses of social well-being in relation to levels of development also further show the confirmation of hypothesis. Results of one-way ANOVAs and Tukey post hoc analyses show that quality of life is highly associated with development, reflected by high F test statistics. In spite of this, the policy factors, especially health policy, are bold in affecting the quality of life and income distribution, while the effect of the wealth factor appears to be mediocre. This indicates that while considering the effect of both types of factors, the policy factors stand out comparatively, reflecting their meaningfulness in determining the policy outcome of quality of life and income distribution.

With high positive policy effect, social welfare policy, implying the possibly unavoidable social intervention by the state, would be commendable and welcoming. This turns the research to the second objective.

**Objective 2:** The study examines attitude of some Thai university students with respect to the extent of state intervention in social welfare policy.

**Hypothesis 2:** The students are expected to agree with social welfare policy that requires a lesser degree of resource relocation through progressive taxation. In



essence, they would prefer policy that achieves equality before the law to policy that achieves equal opportunity, and to policy that achieves equal outcome.

The composition and profile of students surveyed are shown in Table 14 (N = 302). Table 15 shows the survey, its analyses, and results, with items 1-17 assessing students' inclination toward social welfare policy in the form of state intervention. Items 18-20 examine their attitude on three types of social equality. Items 21-23 evaluate their tendency toward materialism or non-materialism. Items 24-26 show their actual perception on stratification. And items 27-29 reveal their degree of altruism. With the provision of two to three response options, the proportion of students' response categories are analyzed by single sample chi square tests or goodness-of-fit, yielding chi square values ( $\chi^2$ ). All the chi square test results are also summarized on the very right-hand side of each survey item.

Table 14

General composition and profile of Thai students surveyed for Objective 2

Attributes	Classifications	
Gender	127 Males (42.1%)	175 Females (57.9%)
Religion	283 Buddhists (93.7%)	19 Others (6.35%)
Faculty	139 Sciences (46.0%)	163 Social sciences (54.0%)
Degree	207 Undergraduates (68.5%)	95 graduates (31.5%)
Income	Less than 10,000 = 0*	10,001 – 20,000 = 0*
	20,000 - 30,000 = 67 (22.2%)	30,001 – 40,000 = 60 (19.9%)
	40,001 – 50,000 = 52 (17.2%)	More than 50,000 = 123 (40.7%)

\* Students are purposively sampled to include only those from middle class families or above.

Therefore, only those with family income of at least 20,000 bahts per month are sampled.

Table 15

Result of survey on students' attitude and related chi square values

1. ใครควรช่วยเหลือเด็กกำพร้าก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก		$\chi^2 = 80.58^{**}$
รัฐ = 78 (25.8%)	ญาติ = 224 (74.2%)	(Not pro-welfare)

(Table 15 continued)

2. หากต้องเลือก ท่านอยากให้รัฐบาลทำสิ่งใดก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก		
นโยบายสังคม = 202 (66.9%)		$\chi^2 = 34.45^{**}$
นโยบายเศรษฐกิจ = 100 (33.1%)		(Pro-welfare)
3. การช่วยเหลือ เช่นการให้เงินแก่คนยากจน ควรเป็นลักษณะใด		
เป็นหน้าที่ของประชาชน = 49 (16.2%)		$\chi^2 = 137.80^{**}$
เป็นไปตามความสมัครใจของประชาชน = 253 (83.8%)		(Not pro-welfare)
4. อย่างไรดี ไม่เป็นธรรม มากกว่ากัน		
คนจำนวนมาก มีฐานะยากจน = 223 (73.8%)		$\chi^2 = 68.66^{**}$
รัฐเก็บภาษีจำนวนมาก จากผู้มีเงินได้ = 79 (26.2%)		(Pro-welfare)
5. หากรัฐบาล จะเก็บภาษีเพิ่มจากท่าน เมื่อท่านมีรายได้ แล้วนำมาช่วยคนพิการให้มากขึ้น ท่านคิดอย่างไร		
เห็นด้วย = 223 (73.8%)		$\chi^2 = 68.66^{**}$
ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย = 79 (26.2%)		(Pro-welfare)
6. ท่านเห็นเด็กขายพวงมาลัยบนท้องถนน ท่านคิดอย่างไรก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก		
ท่านคิดว่ารัฐควรช่วยเหลือ = 210 (69.5%)		$\chi^2 = 46.11^{**}$
ท่านรู้สึกอยากช่วยซื้อพวงมาลัย = 92 (30.5%)		(Pro-welfare)
7. หากต้องเลือก ท่านเลือกสิ่งใดก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก		
ความเท่าเทียมของฐานะทางเศรษฐกิจของประชาชน = 154 (51%)		
เสรีภาพของประชาชน = 148 (49%)		$\chi^2 = .12^{ns}$
8. เมื่อเกิดอุบัติเหตุบนถนน ท่านอยากเห็นสิ่งใดก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก		
เจ้าหน้าที่ของโรงพยาบาลของรัฐ = 207 (68.5%)		$\chi^2 = 41.54^{**}$
เจ้าหน้าที่อาสาสมัครของมูลนิธิต่าง ๆ = 95 (31.5%)		(Pro-welfare)
9. เมื่อมีการหย่าร้าง ท่านคิดว่าอย่างไรดีเหมาะสมกว่ากัน		
การจ่ายค่าเลี้ยงดูบุตร เป็นหน้าที่ตามกฎหมาย = 240 (79.5%)		$\chi^2 = 104.91^{**}$
การจ่ายค่าเลี้ยงดูบุตร เป็นไปตามความสมัครใจ = 62 (20.5%)		(Pro-welfare)

(Table 15 continued)

10. ท่านคิดอย่างไร กับการที่ผู้มีรายได้น้อย ได้รับสิทธิประโยชน์ในสังคม เช่นการศึกษา หรือสาธารณสุข มากกว่าผู้มีรายได้สูง		
ยุติธรรม = 226 (74.8%)		$\chi^2 = 74.50^{**}$
ไม่ยุติธรรม = 76 (25.2%)		(Pro-welfare)
11. อย่างไร ยุติธรรม มากกว่ากัน		
ผู้มีรายได้มาก แบ่งปันเงินแก่ผู้มีรายได้น้อย = 90 (29.8%)		$\chi^2 = 49.29^{**}$
ผู้ที่ทำงานหนัก มีรายได้สูง = 212 (70.2%)		(Not pro-welfare)
12. ท่านคิดอย่างไร กับการที่รัฐเก็บภาษี ที่บ่งชี้ความมั่งมี เช่นภาษีมรดก หรือภาษีที่ดิน ในอัตราสูง ๆ แล้วนำมากระจายให้ผู้มีรายได้น้อย		
ยุติธรรม = 229 (75.8%)		$\chi^2 = 80.58^{**}$
ไม่ยุติธรรม = 73 (24.2%)		(Pro-welfare)
13. หากญาติสนิทของท่านชราภาพ และต้องการการดูแลจากท่าน ท่านคงรู้สึก		
ยินดี แต่อาจไม่ค่อยสะดวก เพราะท่านคงมีภาระหน้าที่อื่นด้วย = 77 (25.5%)		
ยินดี และจะดูแลแน่ = 225 (74.5%)		$\chi^2 = 72.53^{**}$ (Not pro-welfare)
14. เมื่อท่านมีรายได้ ท่านยินดีจ่ายภาษี เป็นกึ่งเปอร์เซ็นต์ของรายได้ของท่าน เพื่อให้รัฐนำไปช่วยคนจน <sup>▼</sup>		
$\bar{X} = 7.05\%$	$SD = 8.08$	
15. ท่านเห็นด้วยกับอย่างไรมากกว่ากัน		
ความแตกต่างของฐานะ ระหว่างคนจน-คนรวย แสดงถึงความบกพร่องของสังคม = 160 (53%)		
ความแตกต่างของฐานะ ระหว่างคนจน-คนรวย เป็นเรื่องธรรมดาของสังคม = 142 (47%)		$\chi^2 = 1.07^{ns}$
16. หากท่านสามารถเลือกได้ ท่านจะเลือกไปใช้บริการที่ใด เป็นอันดับแรก		
โรงพยาบาลของรัฐ = 84 (27.8%)		$\chi^2 = 59.46^{**}$
โรงพยาบาลเอกชน = 218 (72.2%)		(Not pro-welfare)





(Table 15 continued)

17. หากรัฐบาล จะเก็บภาษีเพิ่มจากท่าน เมื่อท่านมีรายได้ เพื่อนำมาพัฒนาคุณภาพบริการขนส่งสาธารณะ เช่นรถประจำทาง รถไฟฟ้า รถไฟ ท่านคิดอย่างไร

เห็นด้วย = 223 (73.8%)  $\chi^2 = 68.66^{**}$

ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย = 79 (26.2%) (Pro-welfare)

18. ท่านคิดอย่างไร: ประชาชนไทย ควรได้รับการปฏิบัติโดยกฎหมาย เสมอเหมือนกัน

เห็นด้วย = 284 (94%)

เฉย ๆ = 18 (6%)  $\chi^2 = 234.29^{**}$

ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย = 0 (0%) \* (Pro-equality before the law)

19. ท่านคิดอย่างไร: ประชาชนไทย ควรได้รับบริการด้านการศึกษาฟรีจากรัฐ จนถึงชั้นมัธยม หรือเทียบเท่า เสมอเหมือนกัน

เห็นด้วย = 273 (90.4%)

เฉย ๆ = 26 (8.6%)  $\chi^2 = 445.16^{**}$

ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย = 3 (1.0%) (Pro-equal opportunity)

20. ท่านคิดอย่างไร: ประชาชนไทย ควรได้รับแบ่งทรัพยากรในสังคม เช่นทรัพย์สิน ความมั่งคั่ง และรายได้ อย่างเท่าเทียมกัน

เห็นด้วย = 158 (52.3%)

เฉย ๆ = 85 (28.1%)  $\chi^2 = 52.34^{**}$

ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย = 59 (19.5%) (Pro-equal outcome)

21. หากต้องเลือก ท่านเลือกอย่างไรมาก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก

งานที่ชอบ = 176 (58.3%)  $\chi^2 = 8.28^{**}$

งานที่ได้เงินดี = 126 (41.7%) (Mostly non-materialists)

22. หากต้องเลือก ท่านจะเลือกร่วมทำงานกับใครก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก

คนที่มีชื่อเสียงในสังคม = 39 (12.9%)  $\chi^2 = 166.15^{**}$

คนดี = 263 (87.1%) (Mostly non-materialists)

23. ท่านคิดอย่างไร: เงิน เป็นที่มาของความสุขได้มาก

เห็นด้วย = 204 (67.5%)  $\chi^2 = 37.21^{**}$

ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย = 98 (32.5%) (Mostly materialists)

(Table 15 continued)

24. ท่านมักเลือกอยู่ในกลุ่มคนที่มีสถานภาพทางสังคม-เศรษฐกิจใกล้เคียงกับท่าน		
ใช่ = 211 (69.9%)		$\chi^2 = 47.68^{**}$
ไม่ใช่ = 91 (30.1%)		(Perceiving stratification)
25. ในสังคมรอบ ๆ ตัวท่าน คนที่มีสถานภาพทางสังคม-เศรษฐกิจใกล้เคียงกัน มักรวมกลุ่มอยู่ด้วยกัน		
คิดว่าจริง = 264 (87.4%)		$\chi^2 = 169.13^{**}$
ไม่น่าจะจริง = 38 (12.6%)		(Perceiving stratification)
26. คนจนมักเสียเปรียบคนรวย		
เห็นด้วย = 274 (90.7%)		$\chi^2 = 200.38^{**}$
ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย = 28 (9.3%)		(Perceiving stratification)
27. ท่านบริจาคเงิน-สิ่งของ บ่อยแค่ไหน		
บ่อย = 112 (37.1%)		$\chi^2 = 20.15^{**}$
ไม่ค่อยบ่อย = 190 (62.9%)		(Mostly non-altruistic)
28. ท่านทำงานอาสาสมัคร บ่อยแค่ไหน		
บ่อย = 31 (10.3%)		$\chi^2 = 190.73^{**}$
ไม่ค่อยบ่อย = 271 (89.7%)		(Mostly non-altruistic)
29. ท่านประกอบกิจกรรมทางศาสนา บ่อยแค่ไหน		
บ่อย = 100 (33.1%)		$\chi^2 = 34.45^{**}$
ไม่ค่อยบ่อย = 202 (66.9%)		(Mostly non-altruistic)

Note:  $** p < .01$   $^{ns} p > .05$

\* Since no data exists for this response category, chi square is computed based on two response categories (เห็นด้วย & เจย ๆ). This is unlike the other two items regarding social equality (Items 19 and 20), where the proportions of three response categories are computed for chi square values.

▼ Since chi square test is irrelevant for this item,  $\bar{X}$  (%) is computed. High  $\bar{X}$  = Pro-welfare.

All but two chi square tests yield significant results of  $p < .01$ . In fact, chi square values are mostly very large, reflecting strong attitude in a particular direction in each survey item. For items used to assess attitude on state intervention, 9/16 of items reveal strong inclination toward social welfare policy, while 5/16 show attitude of non-favoring

state intervention. For social equality, usually as a result of social welfare policy of some kind, the results all confirm the hypothesis of objective 2. Students' disposition toward equality before the law is the greatest of all three types of equality, while equal opportunity attracts somewhat fewer students. The proportion of pro-equal outcome attitude is the smallest, resulting in a smaller chi square, despite its high significance, still. The results should be concluded as surprising, particularly when over half of students agree with equal outcome as social goal, requiring social welfare policy, despite its radical nature in income redistribution. For the extent of materialism, 2/3 of items show non-materialism, while 1/3 indicate materialism. Students perceive high stratification within Thai society, indicated by large chi square results in all three items assessing the perception of social stratification. Lastly, most students confess non-altruism, with infrequent prosocial behaviors. In summary of survey of students' attitude, they tend to favor government's intervention in social welfare, express pro-equality attitude. They also tend to claim themselves as non-materialists and perceive their society as stratified.

In response to the second objective, for social welfare policy making, a higher extent of public spending on the policy, as well as the increase in social equality may be more welcomed by the public than one might have expected. In spite of the necessary relocation of resources, if social welfare policy and equality are to be pursued, these students from middle to upper income families still call for such policies. But with the available data on the assessment of materialism, altruism, and perception of social stratification, how these factors relate to the attitude toward social welfare policy and equality is further examined by simple correlation analyses, as shown in Table 17. But prior to such analyses, composite, quantitative scores of these factors are formed by the summation of related variables, rendering new quantitative variables specified in Table 16.



Table 16

Composite scores of questionnaire items forming separate kinds of students' attitude

Attitude variables	Items	$\bar{X}$	SD	Minimum	Maximum	Meanings
Attitude toward social welfare policy	1-17 <sup>▼</sup>	23.14	2.14	16	32	Minimum = pro-policy Maximum = Not pro-policy
Attitude toward progressive tax	14	7.05	8.08	0	100	Minimum = Against tax Maximum = Pro-tax
Attitude toward equality	18-20	3.84	.96	3	9	Minimum = Pro-equality Maximum = Not pro-equality
Materialism	21-23 <sup>•</sup>	4.78	.83	3	6	Minimum = Materialistic Maximum = Non-materialistic
Perception of social stratification	24-26	3.52	.71	3	6	Minimum = Stratified Maximum = Non-stratified
Altruism	27-29	5.20	.88	3	6	Minimum = Altruistic Maximum = Non-altruistic

<sup>•</sup> Scores for Item 21 are reversed, so that responses are in the similar direction with that of Items 22 and 23.

<sup>▼</sup> Item 14 is excluded, due to its different measurement.

Table 17

Significant results of simple correlation analyses among the scores of students' attitude

Variables (pairs)	$r$	Meanings
Welfare, Tax	- .21**	Those with pro-social welfare policy attitude are willing to pay progressive tax.
Welfare, Materialism	- .13*	Those with pro-social welfare policy attitude are self-proclaimed non-materialists
Welfare, Equality	.32**	Those preferring state's social welfare policy like to see social equality.
Materialism, Stratification	.12*	Materialistic students tend to perceive their societies as highly stratified.

\*  $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .01$

Linking the general composition of the sample of students surveyed, the study shows that females have more pro-social welfare policy attitude than males ( $t_{300} = 1.74$ ,  $p = .08$ ). Students from lower family income brackets also have pro-social welfare policy attitude than those coming from higher income brackets ( $F_{3, 298} = 3.73$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Tukey post hoc comparisons show a large distinction between the attitude of students with monthly family income of 40,001-50,000 bahts and those with income of greater than 50,000 bahts.

In conclusion of data analysis, this research reveals strong social welfare policy effect on social well-being and social equality. With the contention of state intervention versus non-intervention, this result should provide policy makers with concrete evidence, suggesting worthwhile movement toward more state welfare. Result of survey on Thai university students reveals their favorable attitude toward social welfare policy of the state, hence, suggesting this policy direction to policy makers. With these remarks, the next chapter takes on a more in-depth discussion of the results.



สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

## Discussion

This research is by no means intended to be an evaluation research in a strict sense, which usually needs a thorough examination and measure of policy implementation in specific cases or locations. Instead, this research, particularly in Objective 1, takes advantage of existing secondary data collected and published by the World Bank (2000/2001) to examine the effect of social welfare policy by defining it to be health and education policies or public expenditure on these policies. The nature of the effect – income distribution, life expectancy, child mortality rate, infant mortality rate, primary school enrollment, secondary school enrollment, and illiteracy rate – is close to the policy outcome of public policy spending. Does the policy matter upon the final outcome? The answer is “yes, it does, a great deal,” which well supports the hypothesis of the first objective. Shown in Table 4, health policy determines almost all positive policy outcomes, except those that should be more associated with education policy, such as primary and secondary school enrollment. The more public health spending is, the higher income distribution, the longer life expectancy, the less child and infant mortality rates, and also the less illiteracy rate.

Education policy, albeit determining some essential outcomes, such as secondary school enrollment and lower illiteracy rate, is less powerful. This might be due to more similar treatment of education policy among the countries in the study. It is one of the less contentious areas in public policy, as there is a broad agreement in most societies and among policy actor that the state has a necessary and legitimate role in ensuring that education of acceptable quality is provided in an adequate level. It is a policy sector which exhibits the greatest similarity among the Southeast Asian nations (Ramesh & Asher, 201: 180 & 119). Most countries and most cultures view children as very important to society. If well-raised and well-educated, they become productive citizens, contributing to economic prosperity. However, when education and health policies are tested in separate regression equations to delineate each effect as shown in Tables 7 and 8, the power of education policy in affecting positive policy outcomes



emerges. It is shown to influence school enrollment as well as decreased illiteracy rate. In the U.S., for example, education helps ensure the capacity to participate in democracy and also serves as a partial substitute for a formal social welfare program. Health policy, also when considered alone, affect positively all the social outcomes, as shown in Table 8. Both health and education increase the general welfare of the whole society, because they are essential services that create opportunity and, hence, equal opportunity among citizens. The healthy have no excuse not to put in work effort that brings quality of life. Similarly, those with education have means to depend on the selves, not on others and the state (Lustig, 2000: 3). Health and education are public goods, in that they comprise a source of external effect, rendering healthy society, fewer contagious diseases, and quality, sophisticated population (Stiglitz, 2000: 215).

The finding on the particularly strong health policy effect seems to contradict Morgan and LaPlant (1996), studying state and local spending in the U.S. for health and hospitals. They found the spending to affect immediate policy output, such as the increase in hospital beds and health workers. However, health outcome, measured by low infants' birth weight, low infant and child mortality, are affected neither by spending nor the immediate variables, according to both multiple regression and path analyses. Teen birth, a socio-demographic factor, is found instead to render more powerful, but adverse effect (p. 226). Even though the findings of these two studies differ, they are conducted on different scales – global versus national – which might be the explanation for the difference. Variables included in the studies are also not exactly similar.

Turning back to the present research, one finds urbanization, measured by the proportion of urban residents, to exert equally strong effect as health policy factor. Except for income distribution, urbanization tends to determine the rest of social outcome measures, as suggested by Table 4. When health and education are analyzed separately, education policy is also approximately comparable to urbanization in their explanatory power, leaving behind many others, as Table 7 illustrates. This finding well confirms the Convergence Thesis or the Industrial Society perspective, positing that the state's role in social affairs increases with social needs generated by industrialization

and economic development, using urbanization as a proxy. With the change from an agrarian society to modern, industrialized society follows a relocation of labor from local, rural areas to cities, decreasing the family size (Tang, 1996: 378). The need for more institutional welfare, such as child care and elderly care, emerges, hence, the convergence of the agrarian, rural societies of the East and South to the industrialized North and West.

Despite the confirmation shown, Ramesh and Asher (2001) identify a few exceptions to the Industrial Society Perspective, hence, questioning urbanization as the sole determinant of social welfare policy. Concentrating their study in Southeast Asia, they argue that Singapore is the most industrialized country with the highest living standards in the region; but it does not have the most developed social policies. On the other hand, the Philippines experiences heavy state involvement in social affairs at an early stage of economic development and then went backward, despite the industrial progress. In terms of urbanization, Singapore, too, is the clear leader, but again not on the statutory social welfare front (p. 5). In thinking along the argument of Ramesh and Asher (2001), some might see urbanization and industrialization as large concepts. Besides interacting somehow among themselves, such as industrialization introducing urbanization, there might also be additional variables in the picture. For instance, modernization and industrialization usually developed at a later time than agrarian societies. With industrialization that leads societies into the modern time period, the sense of morality and obligation to members of society might emerge.

What would a modern, urban, industrialized society's perspective to hunger, destitute, despair, lack of opportunities, poor health, and illiteracy? What would other societies feel toward that society? Differences, however, might exist between whether or not there are means to alleviate those negative conditions. If the means to do so exist within the society, meaning that there is internal disparity in income and resource distribution, relocation of material resources within that society possibly takes place. On the other hand, if the whole society is indigent throughout, relocation of wealth possibly occurs across societies and boundaries.



But in any case, negative social conditions or unsound quality of life could be regarded immoral in modern, urbanized societies. Within such societies are concepts of social justice, human rights, and social rights of citizenship. Chatterjee (2002) regards resources distribution as one tail of social justice. At times, distributive justice may call for taxing the wealthy to pay the destitute. For a group or society to retain its integrity, its members cannot be allowed to starve or become destitute (p. 374). Social rights permit people to make their living standards independent of pure market force. They help decommodify people and their labor, as they do not always have to sell their labor, such as during sickness, child raising, old-age, or incapacitation. But social rights are contentious, since they are resource-dependent, which is exactly similar to policies that achieve equal opportunities and equal outcome. On the other hand, political rights, such as the right to vote, to form groups, to public hearing, and to equal treatment before the law are not as much dependent on social resources (Twine, 1994: 102-112). Human rights, developed at the early modern period, encompass a wider range of rights which are both resource dependent and sometimes independent. Thomas Jefferson defined them as the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. At times, it takes resources to fulfill people's right to life and happiness; hence, their relocation within or among societies is unavoidable. The wide range in nature of human rights, of course, usually includes the basics, such as right to food, medicine and health care, shelter, and education. These latter examples of basics make those rights close to equal opportunities (Heywood, 1994: 141-147).

With the notions of rights, justice, and equality, social welfare emerges in modern, urban societies. The difficulty and controversy appear, as to how to create incentives for resource relocation, especially on the part of the wealthy. But that is not enough. Making the less wealthy become self-sufficient and, therefore, not dwelling on other and the state for too long a time, is today considered necessary, given the controversial nature of income redistribution (Chatterjee, 2000: 374)

Despite the controversy, the second objective of this present research finds positive attitude among the Thai students in the study toward state intervention in social



welfare policy. Being from the middle class families or above, most with family's monthly income of greater than 50,000 baht, they represent the wealthy, whose resources would be taken and given away to the less wealthy, if there were redistribution policy. Why are these people willing to give part of their wealth to the less fortunate? Perhaps, sense of morality, as most claiming themselves to be non-materialistic, contributes to their willingness and obligation to care for the destitute, the disabled, the elderly living in the same society. According to Table 17, this present research also finds that those self-proclaimed to be non-materialistic have significantly more favorable attitude toward state welfare policy than do materialists. Therefore, as a significantly larger number comprises the non-materialists, this helps strengthen the pro-welfare policy attitude. The students' perception of social stratification, however, exhibits neither relationship to the attitude toward social welfare policy nor that toward equality. The overall pro-social welfare policy attitude might also come from the sense of "the right thing to do" or the logic within a modern society, associated with urbanization and the Convergence Thesis.

Rights in modern, urban, industrialized societies extend to animal rights and welfare, well illustrating modern thoughts within urbanization, helping determine the social well-being. Animal rights theories have developed in popularity since the 1960s, as a result of the growth of environmentalist theorists. Calling for vegetarianism, they assert that animals have rights in the same sense that human beings do. The concept of animal welfare is less radical than animal rights and calls for altruistic concern for the well-being of other species. Like human beings, animals are sentient beings capable of suffering. The movement of animal welfare, albeit not calling for vegetarianism, opposes factory farming and cruel slaughtering (Heywood, 1994: 145-146). The point, then, is that modern thoughts, such as human rights and animal welfare, exist within urban societies, altogether influencing social welfare.

As for other variables – politics, wealth, and religion – they are not as powerful as the social welfare policy factor in influencing social well-being and equality. However, simple correlation analyses of paired variables between each of these variables and the

social well-being indicators show significant results in the correct direction. High degrees of democracy significantly correlate with low rates of child and infant mortality, long life expectancy, large primary and secondary schools enrollment, and low illiteracy. The only insignificance is found between politics and income distribution. The wealth factor relates significantly with all social well-being indicators, with wealthy countries associating with positive social well-being as well as high level of income distribution. In Tables 12 and 13, when all variables are individually analyzed based on three categories of development, which are based mostly on the amplitude of development in economies, significant patterns are found. Developed countries all exhibit favorable social conditions, wealth, high level of democracy, as well as large social welfare expenditure. The opposite is true for the lower developed countries. With religion as a social factor, positive social well-being is highly related to Christian countries, whereas Islamic countries associate with negative indicators, with countries of other religions in between. Religion, however does not determine income distribution. Of course, when analyzed together, the policy factors and urbanization foreshadow all these other variables in their association with social well-being, underscoring the strength of social welfare policies and urbanization. Similarly, with the policy factors when analyzed as dependent measures, simple correlation analyses reveal all significant paired variables. High level of democracy and wealth, as well as Christian countries associate well with high level of social welfare spending.

#### **New Convergence Thesis**

The Convergence Thesis explains the coming together of social welfare policy and well-being and urbanization (Tang, 1996: 377-379; Ramesh & Asher, 2001: 5-6). This research, in combining the empirical findings with some social policy and welfare literature, proposes some different ways of perceiving this theory or the New Convergence Thesis. First, the positive effect of social welfare policy on social well-being and income distribution in this present study should mean the continuation of social welfare spending, despite the contention of the issue of welfare and wealth and resource redistribution. Various political ideologies, some contradicting among



themselves, are responsible for such contention, such as concepts of justice, equality, income distribution, rights, entitlements, and means-testing. Contradicting ideologies, such as the New Right, Social Darwinism / effective competition and socialism, as well as between individualism and collectivism, in particular, aggravate the controversy, in which only the most supreme being can distinguish the rights from the wrongs. But the positive empirical findings of this research should help policy makers see the worthiness of government's intervention. According to Wintersteen and Wintersteen's study (1997) on families and mental illness in Malaysia and Zimbabwe, people with mental disabilities receive less support from friends and families than from religious organizations. Adults want to have a life of their own; and bearing responsibility for family members and friends with mental disabilities rids them of that opportunity. Despite the traditional belief in these parts of the world that the extended family rallies around a sick or disabled, shouldering these would definitely be burdensome both financially and psychologically. The survey shows that friends and families are willing to accept partial responsibility; but there is an expression of desire for a half-way assistance from a fortified system of social service. In general, families with disabled members desire a certain level of social services as those provided in the developed world (p. 191-198). Inadequacy of services is usually the issue in most developing countries, such as inadequate health care coverage as well as low quality of services, as compared to those of the developed countries (Beattie, 2000: 131; Gillion, 1994: 29). Tang (1999) also states that spending for social development in China needs to increase, as poverty reduction and education spending is far from sufficient (p. 101).

Traditional believes, particularly those of Asian countries, perhaps somewhat stymie the idea of systemic social welfare policy. Usually based on Confucian values, responsibility for the welfare of individuals falls on the family and clan. When family support is inadequate or unavailable, neighbors who are often of the same clan in China are expected to assist. Similar types of assistance extend from the feudal system, in which landowners often adopt a paternalistic attitude toward their tenants, giving support to the latter (Midgley & Tang, 2002: 72). Citizens of Singapore and Hong Kong,



whose national incomes are high, according to the World Bank (2000/2001), also receive inadequate government's attention in social welfare. In Hong Kong, there is a subordination or adjunct of social policy to economic policy. The status of social policy is low, as the government sees social services as charitable, non-productive burden borne on the back of the productive institutions of the economy. The authority contends that the introduction of any elements in social security program would require very careful consideration of their potential effects on the economy. The subordinate nature of social service to economic policy and programs is due to the pragmatic government of Hong Kong prior to the transfer to China. As this country is not fully democratic, the government usually had to further the legitimacy of its regime by providing enough welfare services for citizens to maintain a certain level of happiness. In this way, social services are created not as an end in itself, but as a means for the undemocratic regime to survive. Similar to many Asian countries, voluntary, charitable organizations come into the picture of social service provision (Yu, 1996: 416-418). Similarly, the low public spending on social security in Singapore has permitted low taxes, which has been conducive to attracting foreign investment and promoting economic growth. The ruling politicians are relentless in their attack on the welfare state and in arguing that it promotes indolence, undermines thrifts, and ultimately leads to economic ruin. The Finance Minister, Richard Hu, in the early 1990s stated bluntly: The government does not believe in a crutch economy, in which the rich were heavily taxed to support the poor. The state is seen as the last resort provider and only for those who are very poor and have justifiable reasons for being so. In addition to such policy is the encouragement of the community to care for needy individuals and families. In contrast to the limited state involvement in programs for the aged, the disabled, the sick, and the dependents of the injured and diseased, the programs for families with children are extremely generous. But they are also entirely unrelated to need and, in fact, are designed to reward high income. Singapore has generous children's allowance program directed at mothers who are young, educated, and wealthy. Since 1990, women having their second child have been eligible for a tax rebate of \$ 10,000 if she is

30, and \$5,000 if she is 31. Children's allowance, unlike their counterparts in other countries, are not designed to promote social security, but to encourage child bearing by the educated, well-off families. Its purpose is not to contribute toward the costs of raising children, but to serve as procreation incentive to those well-educated, who can already afford a large family. With respect to social services for the aged, the disabled, the sick, and the dependents of the injured and diseased, these are limited, whereas the privatization effort, moving the responsibility of provision to the private sector, has been the government's emphasis. Of the 64 homes for the aged, only three are operated by the government; the remainders are run by private firms and voluntary and religious organizations. Furthermore, private health and social security scheme – compulsory saving of personal income for use upon retirement and sickness – is used. This means those earning more can save more and can have higher protection than those unable to earn and save enough. Besides privatization, government's hospitals have been gradually transformed into public enterprises, enjoying autonomy in operation and management. Operational autonomy is intended to lead to greater flexibility and competition, which, in turn, is expected to result in greater efficiency and higher service standards. Public hospitals are also expected to recover a greater part of their costs from user fees, while a smaller portion of operational cost should come from general revenues (Ramesh, 1992: 1093-1099).

As indicated by the finding of this present research, wealth alone, a logical factor that should influence social well-being, does not necessarily lead to it. It only contributes to more equal income distribution, but not other aspects of social well-being, such as child and infant mortality rates, as well as life expectancy. Little connection between wealth and social well-being could result from the fact that among the wealthy countries themselves and also among the poorer ones, the amplitude of social welfare policy does differ. The above cases of Hong Kong and Singapore illustrate high income countries, putting little public resources into social welfare policy. Other high income countries are subdivided into different types of welfare states, with, for example, the U.S. as liberal, low decommodification regime; France and Germany with corporatist,



medium decommodification cluster; and most Scandinavian Countries of social democratic, high decommodification kind (Twine, 1994: 145-146). Most continental European countries, such as France, Germany, and Italy have more universalist policies, with welfare services provided as entitlement or social rights, than the U.S. and Japan, heavily using means-testing measures. As of 1998, the U.S. does not provide child allowance benefits, while many other welfare states do. The important consequence is that universalist policy tends to be associated with lower rates of relative poverty (Adolino & Blake, 2001: 271-272). This is in support of the present research discovering a strong connection between social welfare policy and positive social well-being. Therefore, different effort on social welfare policy means different quality of life, hence, justifying government's intervention. Although the U.S.' social welfare policy is clearly of residual type, ever since the building of the country, it has put a high level of public spending on education, resulting in impressive indicators, such as high enrollment rate in all levels especially the higher education. Of course, specific outcomes, such as reading and writing skills as well as students' achievement, have to be carefully and thoroughly measured and compared to those of other welfare states (Adolino & Blake, 2001: 312-313).

Therefore, impressive results of social policy spending in this present research leads to the conclusion that public spending on social welfare policy is important in the functioning of most governments. Even in Singapore, with extensive privatization policy, the government still repeatedly reaffirms its commitment to subsidizing those unable to afford hospital care. Of course, at times, there must be a process of needs determination, that is means-testing and stigmatizing (Ramesh, 1992: 1098-1099). In countries that are not welfare states and usually have low income must set aside spending for social welfare policy if a certain level of social well-being is desired. But Ramesh and Asher (2001) argue that in Southeast Asia, strengthening social policies is difficult, albeit necessary, due to the lack of public debate. The general public has been largely shut out of the public policy process. Among policy makers, there is ignorance of such issue (p.193). Sangiampongsa (2003) argues that in Southeast Asian societies,



citizens, possessing the Asian mentality, do not make a demand upon the state on social policy matter, as compared to environmental issue. The disposition of the people is that the latter affects people's way of life. For social welfare, it is culturally and socially accepted that an individual would depend on the self or family and friends. As a result, the demand on institutionalized, systemic welfare rarely emerges. This present research shows an evidence that a much greater portion of students in the study states that they would take care of the aged in the family, reflecting the traditional Thai belief in extended family value. In a similar vein, a very large number of students believe that caring for orphans should mainly be the responsibility of relatives, rather than the state.

However, Ramesh (2001) argues that the private sector and families are ill-suited for providing social welfare services in adequate quantity to all those who need them. It is simply not possible for family, community, and market to replace the state as the main source of social protection in the modern world. The family's capacity to provide social security is limited, sometimes because some people are without a family or because relatives and families are themselves indigent. More importantly, the proportion of the aged is increasing, while, at the same time, the family size is shrinking, hence, eroding the family's capacity to meet the increasing demand for protection. Added to that is the fact that with age, illnesses and, hence, the need for medical care increase proportionally, exceeding the ability of friends and family. The increasing participation of women in labor market further reduces the number of family members available to provide care (p. 195).

In Ramesh and Asher (2001)'s argument, it is also erroneous to believe that Asian societies are inherently more communitarian than their Western counterparts; and all that is needed to avoid statutory social security is to resist Westernization. A larger percentage of population in the individualistic Western countries participates in volunteer work than in supposedly communitarian Singapore: 39 percent in the U.S., compared to only 6 percent in Singapore. The reality is that modern societies simply do not allow people the time to participate in community efforts to the extent necessary to fulfill the increasing need for them (p. 195).

Low amplitude of state intervention also makes social welfare services unsystematic. There is, then, no guarantee that there will always be welfare for those in need. The needs of physically and mentally disabled are not erratic, but consistent. In Thailand, the operation of shelters for the indigent under the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security is a reality. Inside are mostly deserted people or people with limited means and without family. Many more are outside the shelters, not receiving any assistance. The shelter for males at Thanyaburi receives the funding for food of 40 baht per resident. Private donation in the form of charity lunches are brought in on special occasions, such as on someone's birthdays and Father's Day. But during 1946, there were only 5 such lunches (Paisan, 2003, December 5: p. 22). Charities and donations are based on altruism, which may not always be available, whereas needs of the indigent, such as the need for food and lodging, is a certainty. In this present study, the students report themselves as non-altruistic most of the time, as they reveal infrequent involvement with volunteer work and religious activities, while making donation just as erratically. In addition, the finding of this study reveals neither the relation between altruism and pro-social welfare policy attitude nor between altruism and pro-equality attitude. State intervention will be more able to guarantee the meals and that other basic needs are met. Services to mentally and physically disabled are also unsystematic and, most of the time, nonexistent. With the complaints and demand unheard, this greatly differs from consistent and systematic provision of care and services to those in need in developed, welfare states, such as New Zealand. Tax money is re-allocated to the disabled in the forms of economic compensation – daily allowances, training for possible careers, and residence renovation to fit the need of individual disabled (Pawinee, 2003, June 8: pp. 13-14; With love.. Chaiyan Ratchagoon.., 2004, February 3: p. 26). Furthermore, without state welfare, social welfare is based not only on altruism, but sometimes also reciprocity among the receiver and giver of services and welfare. What will happen if the indigent have nothing to reciprocate, which is almost always the case (Chatterjee, 2002: 374)?



What are the origins of need for social welfare policy? Most of the needs may be divided into two categories – the fault of one's own or sheer luck. The former consists mostly of personal reckless behaviors, such as careless driving, irresponsibility, and inadequate caution, resulting in accidents and long-term expensive medical care and social assistance. On the other hand, sheer chances dictate a large part of our lives, such as being born in poor families in need of child labor, being born disabled in certain ways, and poor health. Certain needs arise due to the natural course of life – old age, in particular. These needs of social services are used in questionnaire items, in order to assess the students' reaction and perspectives. But do these origins of needs enter into consideration of desert for social services? Collectivists, democratic socialists, and institutionalized welfare states would tend to respond uniformly, regardless of reasons behind those needs. Those with a less degree of collectivism, leaning toward individualism, Social Darwinism, and the New Rights would put more consideration on the issue of desert.

This present research finds a significantly higher proportion of students who agree with state intervention, according to the total assessment of attitude. Most people state their willingness to pay tax for relocation to the disabled. Most think that it is state's responsibility toward children in poverty. Most also believe that people with low income should be more entitled to basic services than those with higher income. They are willing to pay on average of 7 percent of their income for tax for income distribution purpose. Most perceive poverty as social injustice. And most feel social policy to be the state's priority over economic policy. Most see the justice for the state to place a high tax rate on wealth, such as heritage and land. Most believe it appropriate for the state to enforce child support payment, in case of divorce or family separation, which may prevent poverty in children. Most see equality as more important than liberty as social justice. In summary, nine of sixteen questionnaire items indicate favorable attitude toward government's intervention in social welfare policy. The purposive sample selects students from the middle class families or above, as it is presumed that these are the families whose wealth and income can be relocated through the



progressive system of taxation to the more indigent. There is an "underdog principle," stating that it is logical to assume favorable attitude toward social equality and social welfare policy through the system of wealth relocation among the less well-off, due to the tangible benefit they receive in the process. Therefore, in the U.S., for instance, blacks are more likely than whites to consider the present distribution of wealth as unjust, to desire more equality, and to feel that income should be based more on needs than on skills. This principle also suggests that females are likely to prefer income equality and distribution than do males (Hurst, 1992: 286). The finding of this present research, on the other hand, suggests that the students from at least middle class families well support social welfare policy, albeit higher taxes facing them. With respect to their attitude toward equality, more often than not, they tend to agree with all three types of equality. A much higher proportion supports the idea of equal outcome, the most radical form of equality, than that opposing it. Of course, the extent of agreement is lower than that of the other two types of equality, as indicated by chi square test results. But this present study did not expect this much favor of social equality in the actual finding. In additional analyses, this study subdivides the sample of middle class students into males and females, as well lower to higher income brackets, and comparatively analyzes social welfare attitude, with respect to such groups. The findings tend to be in line with the underdog principle, in that females tend to have a somewhat more pro-social welfare policy attitude than do males. Similarly, students from families with lower income bracket tend to favor social welfare policy more than those from families of higher income. But in overall, these middle class students seem to exhibit pro-social welfare attitude.

In assessing the extent of materialism, this research finds the students to reveal themselves to be non-materialistic more often than otherwise. Using the composite scores of attitude toward social welfare and policy as well as materialism attitude, this research finds non-materialistic students to favor social welfare policy more than materialists. Thus, these empirical results tend to suggest the convergence toward social welfare policy. Besides, the literature review shows favorable consequences of

public spending and social intervention. For instance, Li (2000) shows a more income distribution as the result of extensive state's social policies. Hutchinson and Schumacher (1995) find a positive relation between government's spending and human development. Adolino and Blake (2001) show a favorable effect of poverty reduction among welfare states using universalist policies, while also showing the positive effect of the U.S. government's spending on education. This present research, of course, finds a strong connection between social well-being and social welfare policy spending.

The second aspect of New Convergence Thesis that this research proposes is new way of thinking regarding social welfare policy. While the welfare states of the Western, developed countries have protected their citizens against hardship and poverty, there are criticisms regarding the expenses involved along with the opposing forces, especially from the Conservative as well as political parties and politicians on the New Right and conservative line of ideology (Atkinson & Hills, 1991: 81-82). Along with the critique on extensive welfare expenditure is the attack on the expanding role of government, which is to the opposite view and direction of the Conservative. Welfare pluralism, hence, emerged as an alternative arrangement of welfare service provision. It can be used to convey the fact that social services and health care may be obtained from four different sectors – the statutory, the voluntary, the commercial, and the informal. Hence, it implies a less dominant role of the state, while seeing it as not the only possible instrument of the collective provision of welfare services. It is used to replace the interventionist government within the hope to rectify the failure of state provision of welfare services through the mixture of state and non-state provision (Johnson, 1987: 55-57). The informal sector and voluntary sector of welfare service provision comprise community care, family care, friends, neighbors, neighborhood organizations, self-help or mutual aid groups, as well as groups primarily concerned with medical or social research. Neighborhood groups, for instance, try to create or cultivate neighborliness, which approximates that of traditional communities. All these support the individualistic, conservative end of the welfare spectrum. This paper, henceforth, argues that the emergence of welfare pluralism idea results in another



perspective of the New Convergence Thesis proposed by this present study. It is the coming together, or a convergence, between the Asian values, traditionally favoring the extended family value and the toning down of the Western, institutionalized system of statutory provision. The convergence is not one simple direction from non-welfare state to a welfare state, with the influence of urbanization and industrialization (Tang, 1996: 377-378). But the Western, developed welfare states also refine their welfare policy to come to terms with the East, developing countries in the use of additional sectors, other than sole state intervention.

Therefore, from this angle, there is almost nothing new about welfare pluralism. It already exists within the mixed command economy with the conspicuous role of the state and the market economy (Danziger, 1996: 234-236). Savas (1987) according to his progressive ideas of privatization, defines it as the act of reducing the role of government or increasing the role of the private sector. Privatization, henceforth, covers a wide range of methods and activities: contract, vouchers, self-service, to name a few. In the fear of the size of the government, the state can reduce its role from welfare service provider to becoming a service arranger (p. 61). Its main role is to ensure the availability and existence of services. In contracting, the government enters into a contract with the private sector, such as business companies, authorizing and paying the latter through tax money to provide social welfare services. In government vending, the government is one among service providers, such as public and private schools, universities, and hospitals. The state, while continuing its services, might encourage private sector's involvement, hence, introducing alternatives to social services. At the same time that competition is introduced, the role of the state is reduced and balanced by the increasing private sector's roles. The state can encourage private provision of social welfare services by subsidizing the service provider in the grant system, or subsidizing the people, giving them vouchers, so that they could pick service providers by themselves. Inter-governmental agreement allows the state to enter into agreement with some local government units for the latter to help provide services to the local people, again adding more alternatives or the number of providers as well as reducing



the role of state to service arranger. Market provision is the purest form of privatization, with non-existing role of the state in some services. But care and caution must be given to the high possibility that the poor, who are in need of welfare services the most, may have no access to them. Of course, in self-services, people take care of themselves or receive care from friends, family, and neighbors. Voluntary services are the form of social services in addendum to inadequate state's services. The state might encourage such voluntary involvement of charitable, religious, or civil society organizations by introducing incentives, such as tax exemption (Savas, 1987: 62-82).

Voluntary provision of social welfare given by the civil society organizations in the form of non-governmental organizations is more extensive in developing countries than in developed ones, mainly due to the insufficient services in the former. With the residual type of social welfare, the NGOs, naturally and by necessity, must compensate for such inadequacy. Through democratization, NGOs in the developing countries like Thailand has grown both in strength and role, not only in the area of social welfare services, but throughout the political system and the public policy process. The exertion of demand into the political system, from time to time, results in conflict and confrontation between the state and NGOs within the detail of policy making and the substance of policies. Nantawat (1998) discusses three forms of interaction between the state and NGOs – supportive, cooperative, and control (p. 9-11). Sangiampongsa (2003) finds a much greater degree of support and cooperation in social welfare policy than in environmental policy, which is bogged down with conflict and confrontation due to the clashes in perspectives, social goals, as well as styles of organizational operation. On the contrary, in social welfare policy, many NGOs tend to take the complementary role, better compensating for the state's residual welfare structure. Pisanu (2003) argues that this is perhaps due to the Asian welfare value in low expectation of welfare from the state. The people have no objection to the existing miniscule state welfare, while welcoming additional services from the non-state sector within the policy implementation phase. In the environmental policy area, the public and NGOs tend to monitor policy making and implementation more closely, lest their local way of life

should be affected by some features of public policy. Therefore, along with the positive effect of social welfare policy and the involvement of the non-state sector in various forms, possibly a new direction of New Convergence Thesis, taken both by the welfare states and non-welfare states like Thailand, shows a positive sign. Similar to the forms of privatization discussed by Savas (1987), co-production as a public administration concept is the mixture and cooperation among participants in service delivery at the policy implementation phase (Brudney & England, 1983: 59).

Disagreement about little or larger role of the state in social welfare will certainly persist. Ramesh (2002) argues against privatization in Southeast Asia, stating that extensive direct provision of health care by the state is a vital reason for the tremendous improvement in health status of the region. Public health facilities are often the only ones available to the poor. Statutory social security programs in the region already covers less than one-quarter of their population because of poor design and restricted eligibility. Most of the growing number of the elderly has depended on their family for income support. The only way social security benefits can be delivered in a comprehensive and equitable manner is for the state to provide them directly from its own general revenues (p. 154-156). Jones (2002) discusses social welfare in Singapore in a more positive manner, perceiving a partnership between state and voluntary sector. Confucianist culture pushes the country toward growth-orientation, rejecting a welfare-dependent society. Nevertheless, the government takes the role of a regulator and facilitator of social welfare services delivered by the voluntary sector – charitable organizations, community associations, ethnically based self-help groups, and religious bodies. The voluntary sector engages in a wide range of personal social services, including provision of care and support to the elderly and disabled, counseling for individuals and families in need or under distress, accommodation and support in-kind for the destitute, help for low income families, pre-school education, and supervision for school children before and after school. As regulator and facilitator, the state oversees these voluntary organizations in the form of service arranger, ensuring the availability and quality of essential services. More significantly, the state's role include partial



funding to these organizations, undertaken by the Ministry of Community Development and Sports, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Home Affairs. Subsidies are also provided by fully offsetting important hidden costs, the most important of which is rental of premises. Nearly all voluntary welfare organizations occupy land and buildings leased by the government. Further costs avoided are vehicle taxes. The exemption, which is granted by the government, is a substantial saving, as vehicle taxes are high in Singapore and can almost treble the vehicle price. There is also a waiver of the charge for employing foreign workers for basic or routine tasks, such as attendants, assistants, and cleaners (pp. 63-68).

Despite the contradiction regarding the appropriate amplitude of state and private sector's role in social welfare, the convergence toward privatization in both original welfare states and non-welfare states is eminent. Yet, there are various forms and degrees of privatization that can be chosen, as suggested by Savas (1987). The level of opposition should decrease with smaller degrees and possibly acceptable forms. The Malaysian health care system is on the verge of privatization, triggering opposition, due to both the high politics in the issue, as well as the public good notion of Malaysian hospitals needed to be operated publicly. Despite the Mahathir administration's commitment in privatization of health care, stated in Vision 2020, the process faced some obstacles. Besides the opposition from the general public, the government also had to consider political feasibility. Malaysians have grown accustomed to the government's dominant role in the provision of low-cost services. UMNO, in addition, must take great care not to alienate its principal constituency, the rural Malays, by appearing to diminish the welfare role of the government. The privatization policy also does not receive support from powerful interest groups that generally should welcome the idea – the Malaysian Medical Association as well as the Malaysian Trade Union Congress – asking the government to reconsider the policy. The government, in toning down the contention, had to resort to a lower amplitude of privatization scheme. Corporatization of hospitals allows the government-owned hospitals more autonomy in their financial and staff management. They are also



encouraged to compete with one another and with the private sector. Actual privatization did take place, but in limited areas. Haemodialysis clinics, known for their expensive service, in public hospitals were contracted out with government's subsidization of dialysis treatment for the poor to mitigate the equity concern. Other support services were also successfully privatized – clinical waste management, cleaning, linen and laundry, facility engineering maintenance, and bio-mechanical engineering maintenance. Such low profile in privatization helped lessening opposition forces, while the main hospital services remain publicly operated (Barraclough, 2000: 340-351).

Although some forms and features of privatization are chosen over others, the positive effect of public health and education spending on social welfare outcome in this present study well suggests its continuation. Health, education and other social services are not only public goods, rendering positive external effect throughout society, but also moral goods. Be the welfare entitlement argued as social rights, collectivism, egalitarianism, or social justice, social welfare policies lessen despair, which, if existing, would be unethical in modern societies. In privatization, the state may assume the role of service arranger and regulator, who oversees the service delivery, its amplitude and quality, while, most of the time, allocating public fund through subsidization or providing the incentives to the private sectors of any forms suggested by Savas (1987). This will maintain the nature of public, moral goods, while, at the same time, minimizing the state's role.

Another feature of the New Convergence Thesis is the convergence of welfare ideologies. The two known polarities are the New Right / individualism, on the one hand and collectivism, on the other. However, Hyde and Dixon (2002) argue that between these two poles, there is some gray area in between. They name the range of ideologies within the welfare spectrum as the following: Communist Collectivism, Social Reformism, Reluctant Individualism, Reluctant Collectivism, and Radical Right. Social Reformism is similar to the welfare state and strong state intervention with the goal of free, equal, and more secure society. In the fear of state failure, Reluctant Individualism

questions public social security provision. Its emergence is also in response to the growing financial burden on the part of the welfare states. Moving closer to the New Right, Reluctant Collectivism encourages individuals to make their own voluntary social security through competitive, but regulated private and occupational savings and insurance plans. While the state is to provide a safety net below which no one should fall, it should also require work participation as a condition of eligibility for publicly social security provision (pp. 20-24). Midgley and Tang (2002) also argue that the individualist-collectivist dichotomy is too crude to capture the complexity of social welfare of the modern time. Most countries have the elements of both. Chile and China, as examples, try to introduce marketization of social securities, reducing the long statist stance. However, the strategies and details of their policies differ. In Chile, the workforce is encouraged to put aside part of their income for social security funds. Contributions are both from the employers and employees, with the state assuming the minimalist role, boldly committing to the individualist ideology. However, it is forced marketization of social welfare, where all workers in regular wage employment are required to participate. The state, hence, also takes on the service arranger role ensuring that those who work prepare themselves for the future, should needs arise. The collectivist, communist China has changed, in that the guaranteed safety net is eroded. The system of guaranteed employment is removed. The strictures of collective agriculture were relaxed to permit family farms, rural markets, and privately owned agricultural industries, and trading enterprises to flourish. The government's primary objective is to relieve individual enterprises from their responsibility to provide income protection to their workers. The objective is to transfer social security obligation from individual enterprises to a centralized Bureau of Social Insurance. Individual workers assume a heavier responsibility in contributing to the social security cost, with partial state's subsidization. This is the reformist or economic efficiency model, as opposed to the socialist model. The Chinese government seeks to use social security as a positive instrument of economic development or state developmentalism. Like some developing countries, the Chinese government formulates social policies that are compatible with



the economic development goal. The history of China that dates back to the time prior to the communist regime would suggest that the modern days' welfare policy is a mixture of the socialist form as well as the traditional Chinese belief in hard work, responsibility, and self-sufficiency of the Confucian values (pp.67-75). Therefore, in both countries, within the move toward individualist / marketization ideology, the state may still reserve its role, of course, with varying degrees and strategies, in relation to ultimate goals of each country. Most countries, in converging to introduce and increase the private sector's role, can still maintain the state's role in certain ways.

The welfare states of the Western, developed economies have existed through evolutionary forces. The calls for state welfare are when hardship arrives, such as during the Great Depression as well as when societies modernize, industrialize and urbanize (Johnson, 1987: 3-5). All these have occurred in the Western world. State welfare and its expenditure have been endlessly criticized, usually as a source of squander of tax money. Changes have been eminent, in the familiar two forms – spending reduction and reduction in the state's role. One plausible spending cut is the reduction in the amplitude of welfare state, such as from the institutionalized system to the residual welfare or a switch from the universalist scheme to the means-test scheme. The most recent welfare reform in the U.S, besides stressing more of the means-testing procedure, gearing aid to only the most indigent, also places heavier condition upon the recipient of assistance, such as the recipients' acceptance and awareness of the temporary feature of the aid (Kraft & Furlong, 2004: 267-268; Ferge, 1997: 1387-1389). In most countries, new legislation encourages the setting up of private pension and health insurance schemes that are allegedly meant to encourage people to accept more individual responsibility for their future. Another trend is the growing importance of the market, well accepted as a very important social institution. Many of social welfare policies have become market conforming. All these changes, especially expenditure cut, are controversial, full of value judgements. The growing emphasis on the private sector, somehow, seems to be the less contentious direction of change. With a variety of privatization forms suggested by Savas (1997), the least controversial feature could

be selected from the many. Hence, the New Convergence Thesis suggests the coming together of welfare between the welfare and non-welfare states in increasing reliance on the private sector's role.

Spending cut is empirically shown in this present study to have detrimental effect. Therefore, in both welfare states and non-welfare states alike, funding social welfare through the general revenue, of course to varying degrees, is not only unavoidable, but also necessary, if a certain level of social well-being is to be maintained (Ramesh, 2002: 154-155; Adolino & Blake, 2001: 271-272). In Thailand as a non-welfare state, the students' attitude toward state's welfare policy is rather positive, suggesting the continuing expenditure, if policy makers in a democratic country want to be responsive to the public and constituencies. However, this present research by no means suggests that money is everything. But it argues that the money spent on welfare does matter. Therefore, the administration of social welfare policy also requires governance in order to avoid implementation failure. Governance ensures that policy is made to work efficiently and effectively. It includes questions of institutional structure, management, administration, methods of operation, methods of ensuring compliance with the rules of the system, and the training of personnel. The administration of social welfare policy, in particular, requires reliable record keeping over a long period, especially in the case of pensions. Rules and regulations must be followed and honored; otherwise, corruption will occur. Extending services to the informal sector of the economy would be an administrative challenge, since approximately 40 percent of the workforce is in that sector (Gillion, 1994: 26-28; Ramesh, 2000: 541).

จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย



## Conclusion

The disposition of this research is pro-social welfare policy, arguing for the state to pursue the social well-being as an ultimate goal, rather than preserving the minimalist ideology. Even someone with a rather strong individualist, Social Darwinist perspective must sense some degrees of injustice in despair, diseases, illiteracy, and suffering. The justification of this research is the contentious nature of the debate on the appropriate level of social welfare policy. The arguments for and against it all have logical support on both sides, hence, making justification difficult in either ways. The first part of the research shows an empirically strong positive effect of social welfare policy, operationally defined to be public expenditure on health and education, on social welfare outcomes – infant and child mortality, life expectancy, primary and secondary school enrollment, and illiteracy rate. The strength of the policy effect on equality or income distribution is lower, however. Between health and education policies, the former exhibits a stronger effect than the latter. Political, economic, and social variables are included in the analyses as comparative method, vis-à-vis the policy function. Along with the policy factors, urbanization, as a social factor, encompasses an equally strong effect, confirming the Convergence Thesis. Political and economic factors, along with religion as another social factor, when analyzed individually, also affect social well-being in logical manners. The overall interpretation is that policy, or social welfare spending does matter in its contribution to quality of life.

The second part of the study examines a sample of Thai undergraduate students in their fourth year or above and graduate students with respect to their attitude toward government welfare policy. Coming from a background of middle class families, the students self-reported a favorable attitude toward social welfare spending. This result implies that the government spending on social welfare will be more or less well supported by the middle class, who possess some degrees of wealth needed for relocation in most welfare policies. The sample of students also self-reported to be non-materialists who tend to exhibit pro-social welfare policy attitude than do materialists,

hence, leading to a rather positive prospect of social welfare policy in the government function.

All the empirical results as well as the welfare literature lead this research to propose the New Convergence Thesis. It firstly argues that the norm for social welfare spending will continue, with the non-welfare states, like Thailand, furthering their welfare budget, owing to the positive effect of social welfare spending as well as the positive public attitude toward state's role. Spending is one key factor, albeit not the only one, for the quality of life. Hence, the welfare states and non-welfare states converge on the issue of social welfare expenditure. Also, as a country goes through the stages of democratization up to a junction such as the democratic consolidation, politicians and political parties usually have to propose policies that are responsive to the public needs. They are not independent of the public, but indeed, hold on their support. (Yu, 1996: 418; Ramesh, 2000: 541-542) Both welfare and non-welfare states also converge on the globalizing trend of privatization, as the call for a minimal state would be difficult to be stymied in this era. In essence, the developing countries, mostly non-welfare states, in their Asian values, for example, have, for a long time, relied on the private sector in delivering social services. Johnson (1987) calls this the informal sector – the community care, family care, friends, clans, and neighbors – which is part of the more general concept of welfare pluralism (p. 64-70). In conjunction to this is the proposal of various forms of privatization by Savas (1987), along with the state's role as service arranger, as opposed to service provider. Instead of switching to the marketization of social securities, such as the individual contribution to private insurance, certain features of privatization, such as informal and voluntary sectors, would engender less opposition and are, therefore, politically viable. This is on the part of the present welfare states. For their counterpart in mostly developing countries, the private sector could continue its role, such as that of the civil society organizations, which have already played a large role in many policy areas and in supplement to usually inadequate state welfare services. It is not at all necessary that a society stay on polar ends of private-public sector spectrum. In welfare ideologies, as well, there is a range of ideological



possibilities, not simply the individualist and collectivist ideologies. Societies converge to the middle of the spectrum. Within this aspect of convergence to more privatization, this research argues, however, that the state should continue its role in ensuring the existence and adequacy of social welfare services as service arranger and regulator. Even more important is its spending responsibility, through various forms of funding provided for the private sector.

Table 18 shows the Thai state's spending history of budget allocation from 1989 to 2004 to major welfare agencies – the Ministry of Health; the Ministry of Education; and the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security, which used to be the Department of Public welfare within the Ministry of Labor and Social welfare. The allocation to Department of Social welfare has been very consistent over the years. Department of education also, more or less, has received rather consistent budget throughout; and it has always received the highest budget, as compared to other departments. It is perplexing, however, as to how it will achieve the goal of twelve-year free education for all, according to the 1997 Thai Constitutional mandate. One would expect to see a large jump of budget, once the twelve-year free education mandate is in place, starting approximately 1998-1999. Similarly, despite the Thirty-Baht Health Policy of the present government, the budget allocation shows a decreasing trend, as compared to periods prior to such policy. In order for a policy to be capable of fulfilling its objective, we would expect expenditure to go along with it. Since the Thirty-Baht Health Policy seems to suggest a higher coverage of the people receiving services, a proportional change of budget in terms of its percentage over the total budget would be less surprising. Perhaps, like many criticisms regarding the policy, the budget is not proportional to the actual policy and its service obligation. Despite the twelve-year free education mandate, many public schools hold students' parents and guardians responsible for miscellaneous expenses, such as xeroxing, communication between school and parents or guardians, orientation fees, and sports fees. They have to set aside, on the average, approximately 5,000 bahts for these additional payments per semester (Wallop, 2004, May18: p. 7; Thirty-Baht., 2004, March 26: p. 10).

Table 18

Social spending on health, education, and welfare

Year	Health	Education	Welfare	Total spending
2004	45,225.5	158,037.7	3,918.8	1,028,000.0
% of total	4.4	15.4	.4	
2003	41,995.5	153,420.5	3,399.0	999,900.0
% of total	4.2	15.3	.3	
2002	41,500.6	162,428.0	4,529.2	1,023,000.0
% of total	4.1	15.9	.4	
2001	58,915.1	160,864.2	4,496.9	910,000.0
% of total	6.5	17.7	.5	
2000	59,183.6	159,261.4	4,448.0	860,000.0
% of total	6.9	18.5	5.2	
1999	57,144.6	151,579.8	3,618.8	825,000.0
% of total	6.9	18.4	.4	
1998	70,145.5	166,308.9	4,695.4	982,000.0
% of total	7.1	16.9	.5	
1997	66,544.3	157,972.5	4,333.5	944,000.0
% of total	7.0	16.7	.5	
1996	56,545.9	133,789.6	3,580.8	843,200.0
% of total	6.7	15.9	.4	
1995	45,102.7	110,657.8	3,008.4	715,000.0
% of total	6.3	15.5	.4	
1994	39,343.7	100,304.1	2,415.2	625,000.0
% of total	6.3	16.0	.4	
1993	32,898.1	88,177.3	2,095.6	560,000.0
% of total	5.9	15.7	.4	
1992	24,345.4	69,542.7	1,540.6	460,400.0
% of total	5.3	15.1	.3	



(Table 18 continued)

Year	Health	Education	Welfare	Total spending
1991	20,568.6	62,158.5	1,525.8	387,500.0
% of total	5.3	16.0	.4	
1990	15,926.5	50,320.3	994.7	335,000.0
% of total	4.8	15.0	.3	
1989	11,733.1	40,365.0	826.1	285,500.0
% of total	4.1	14.1	.3	

(From Bureau of the Budget, Budget in brief 1989-2004.)



สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย



### Suggestion for further work

There are a large number of research topics in the area of social welfare policy, especially in the developing, non-welfare states. This present study comprises an aggregate analysis of available data on social welfare spending and its outcome. Research of a smaller scale, such as that of a case study type, gearing toward health policy or policy directed specifically at specific groups such as the mentally disabled or children with long-term illness might provide a complement to this present study. Also, since the second part of this research employs the purposive sampling of university students from upper years in examining their attitude toward social welfare policy, a larger population covering more groups in the society might be of benefit to the academics and society.

สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย



## References

1997 Thai Constitution.

Adolino, Jessica R. & Blake, Charles H. (2001). Comparing public policies: Issues and choices in six industrialized countries. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Atkinson, A. B. & Hills, John. (1991). Social security in developed countries: Are there lessons for developing countries? In Ehtisham Ahmad, Jean Dreze, John Hills, and Amartya Sen (Eds.), Social security in developing countries (pp. 81-111). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Barraclough, Simon. (2000). The politics of privatization in the Malaysian health care system. Contemporary Southeast Asia, 22(2), 340-359.

Beattie, Roger. (2000). Social protection for all: But how? International Labor Review, 139(2), 129-148.

Brudney, Jeffrey & England, Robert E. (1983). Toward a definition of the coproduction concept. Public Administration Review, 43(1), 59-65.

Bureau of the Budget. Budget in brief, fiscal years 1989-2004 (งบประมาณโดยสังเขป ประจำปีงบประมาณ 2532-2547).

Chanley, Sharon A. & Alozie, Nicholas O. (2001). Policy for the 'deserving,' but politically weak: The 1996 Welfare Reform Act and battered women. Policy Studies Review, 18(2), 1-25.

Chatterjee, Pranab. (2002). Two tails of justice. Families in society, 83(4), 374-386.

Crone, Donald K. (1993). States, elites, and social welfare in Southeast Asia. World Development, 21(1), 55-66.

Danziger, James N. (1996). Understanding the political world: A comparative introduction to political science. New York: Longman Publishers U.S.A.

Ferge, Zsuzsa. (1997). The perils of the welfare state's withdrawal. Social Research, 64(Winter), 1,381-1,402.

Freedom House. (2002). Freedom in the world 2002: The democracy gap.  
www.freedomhouse.org

- George, Vic & Wilding, Paul. (1994). Welfare and ideology. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Gillion, Colin. (1994). Social security and protection in the developing world. Monthly Labor Review, 117(Sept.), 24-31.
- Harnett, Donald L. & Murphy, James L. (1986). Statistical analysis for business and economics (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Heywood, Andrew. (1994). Political ideas and concepts: An introduction. Hampshire: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Hurst, Charles E. (1992). Social inequality: Forms, causes, and consequences. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hutchinson, Gladstone & Schumacher, Ute. (1995). Government policy and human development: Evidence from developing countries. Journal of Third World Studies, 12(Fall), 245-272.
- Hyde, Mark & Dixon, John. (2002). Welfare ideology, the market, and social security: towards a typology of market-oriented reform. The Review of Policy Research, 19(3), 14-36.
- International Labor Office (ILO). (1984). Introduction to social security. Geneva: Author.
- Jansson, Bruce S. (1990). Social welfare policy: From theory to practice. California: Wadsworth publishing Company.
- Johnson, Norman. (1987). The welfare state in transition: The theory and practice of welfare pluralism. Sussex: Wheatsheaf Books Ltd.
- Jones, David Seth. (2002). Welfare and public management in Singapore: A study of state and voluntary partnership. Asia Journal of Public Administration, 24(1), 57-85.
- Kraft, Michael E. & Furlong, Scott R. (2004). Public policy: Politics, analysis, and alternatives. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Langley, Winston E. (1997). Socio-cultural rights and development. Journal of Third World Studies, 14(Fall), 133-160.



- Li, He. (2000). Political economy of income distribution: A comparative study of Taiwan and Mexico. Policy Studies Journal, 28(2), 275-291.
- Lund, Brian. (2002). Understanding state welfare: Social justice or social exclusion? London: SAGE Publications.
- Lustig, Nora & Stern, Nicholas Herbert. (2000). Broadening the agenda for poverty reduction: Opportunity, empowerment, security. Finance & Development, 37(4), 3-7.
- MacGregor, Susanne. (1999). Welfare, neo-liberalism, and new paternalism: Three ways for social policy in late capitalist societies. Capital & Class, 67(Spring), 91-118.
- Midgley, James & Tang, Kwong-leung. (2002). Individualism, collectivism, and the marketization of social security: Chile and China compared. The Review of Policy Research, 19(3), 57-84.
- Minami, Ryoshin & Kim, Kwan S. (1999). Introduction: Themes and challenges. In Ryoshin Minami, Kwan S. Kim, & Malcolm Falkus (Eds.), Growth, distribution, and political change: Asia and the wider world (pp. 3-19). New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- Morgan, David R. & LaPlant, James T. (1996). The spending-service connection: The case of health care. Policy studies journal, 24(2), 215-229.
- Musgrave, Richard A. & Musgrave, Peggy B. (1989). Public finance in theory and practice (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Nantawat Boramanan (นันทวัฒน์ บรมานันท์). (1998). Research report on the means to promote the operation of non-governmental organizations: The case study of laws and regulations that are obstacles to development (รายงานการวิจัยเรื่องแนวทางในการส่งเสริมการดำเนินการขององค์กรพัฒนาเอกชน: ศึกษาเฉพาะกรณีกฎหมายและระเบียบต่าง ๆ ที่เป็นอุปสรรคต่อการพัฒนา). Bangkok: P. Press, Inc.
- Paisan Tangyarit (ไพศาล ตั้งยะฤทธิ). (2003, December 5). Thanyaburi Shelter for Males seeks donation on the Fathers' Day (สถานสงเคราะห์ชายัญญูบุรีชวนทำบุญวันพ่อแห่งชาติ. Matichon Daily, p. 22.

- Pawinee Charoenying (ภาวิณีชัย เจริญยิ่ง). (2003, June 8). Tony Christensen: man without legs.. seeking dreams (โทนี่ คริสเตียนเซน: ชายไร้ขา.. ตามล่าฝันสุดขอบฟ้า). Matichon Daily, pp. 13-14.
- Pereitra, Joseph A. & Van Ryzin, Gregg G. (1998). Understanding public support for time limits and other welfare reforms. Policy Studies Journal, 26(3), 398-418.
- Ramesh, M. (1992). Social security in Singapore. Asian Survey, 32(12), 1,093-1,108.
- Ramesh, M. (2000). The state and social security in Indonesia and Thailand. Journal of Contemporary Asia, 30(4), 534-546.
- Ramesh, M. & Asher, Mukul G. (2000). Welfare capitalism in Southeast Asia: Social security, health, and education policies. Hampshire: PALGRAVE.
- Ramesh, M. (2002). Privatization of social security in Southeast Asia. The Review of Policy Research, 19(3), 141-160.
- Rapeepan Kamhom. (ระพีพรรณ คำหอม) (2002). Social welfare in Thai society. (สวัสดิการสังคมกับสังคมไทย). Bangkok: Arayan Media Inc.
- Ringen, Stein. (1987). The possibility of politics: A study in the political economy of the welfare state. Oxford: Clarendon press.
- Roebroek, Joop M. (1993). Images of the future: The basic income challenge. Policy Studies Review, 12(1/2, Spring/Summer), 114-132.
- Roemer, John E. (1999). Egalitarian strategies, 46(3), 64-74.
- Roller, Edeltraud. (1995). The welfare state: The equality dimension. In Ole Barre & Elinor Scarbrough (Eds.), The scope of Government (pp. 165-197). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rothman, Robert A. (2002). Inequality and stratification: Race, class, and gender (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Jersey: Upper Saddle River.
- Rothstein, Richard. (1998). When states spend more. American Prospect, 36(Jan/Feb), 72-79.
- Sangiampongsa, Pisanu. (1995). Altruism, costs, policies, and pro-environmental behaviors. (Doctoral dissertation, Saint Louis University, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts Ondisc, January 1994-December 1997.



- Sangiampongsa, Pisanu. (2003). Non-governmental organizations and public organizations in the Thai public policy: Their characteristics, roles, and relations. Thai Journal of Development Administration, 43(1), 93-130
- Savas, E. S. (1987). Privatization: The key to better government. New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc.
- Stiglitz, Joseph. (2000). Economics of the public sector (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Tang, Kwong-leung. (1996). The determinants of social security in developing countries: A comparative analysis. International Social Work, 36(Oct.), 377-396.
- Tang, Kwong-leung. (1999). Social development in China: Progress and problems. Journal of Contemporary Asia, 29(1), 95-108.
- The world almanac and book of facts 2001. New Jersey: World Almanac Books.
- The World Bank. (2000/2001). World Development Report 2000/2001: Attacking poverty. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thirty Baht.. how can it survive? (30 บาท ทำอย่างไรจะไปรอด). (2004, March 26). Matichon Daily, p. 10.
- Titmuss, Richard M. (1974). Social policy: An introduction. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Twine, Fred. (1994). Citizenship and social rights: The interdependence of self and society. London: SAGE Publications
- Varshney, Ashutash. (2000). Why have poor democracies not eliminated poverty? Asian Survey, 40(5), 718-736.
- Wallop Tangkananurak (วัลลภ ตังคณานูรักษ์). (2004, May 18). Twelve years of education.. not truly free (เรียน 12 ปี ไม่ฟรีจริง). Matichon Daily, p. 7.
- Wickrama, K. A. S. & Mulford, Charles S. (1996). Political democracy, economic development, disarticulation, and social well-being in developing countries. The Sociological Quarterly, 37(Summer), 375-390.
- Wilensky, Harold L. (2000). Rich democracies: Political economy, public policy, and performance. California: University of California Press.

- Wintersteen, Richard T. & Wintersteen, Lois B. (1997). Families and mental illness: Observations from two developing countries. International Social Work, 40(Apr), 191-207.
- With love.. Chaiyan Ratchagoon: Sixteen years of raising a daughter with Dawn Syndrome (ด้วยรัก.. ไชยันต์ รัชชกุล: 16 ปีที่เฝ้าดูลูกสาวเป็นดาวนจินโดรม. (2004, February 3). Matichon Daily, p. 26.
- Wuthnow, Robert. (1994). What religious people think about the poor. The Christian Century, 11(Sept. 7-14), 812-816.
- Yamane, Taro. (1967). Elementary Sampling Theory. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Yu, Sam W. K. (1996). The nature of social services in Hong Kong. International Social Work, 39(Oct), 411-430.



สถาบันวิทยบริการ  
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย



## Appendix

วันที่ 6 พฤศจิกายน พ.ศ. 2546

**คำอธิบายแบบสอบถาม**

แบบสอบถามที่ขอความอนุเคราะห์จากท่านให้ช่วยตอบนี้ จัดทำขึ้นโดย ดร. พิษณุ เสงี่ยมพงษ์ ตำแหน่งผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ประจำภาควิชาการปกครอง คณะรัฐศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย เพื่อประโยชน์สำหรับโครงการวิจัย ที่ศึกษาประเด็นสาธารณะทางสังคม และเศรษฐกิจของไทย ในปัจจุบัน ภายใต้การสนับสนุนโครงการวิจัย จากกองทุนวิศาดาภิเชกสมโภช จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย แบบสอบถามนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์หลัก ในการศึกษาความคิดเห็นของนักศึกษาระดับชั้นปีที่ 4 ขึ้นไป จากมหาวิทยาลัย ภายในเขตกรุงเทพมหานคร ในประเด็นสาธารณะ โดยเฉพาะด้านสังคม และเศรษฐกิจของไทย

แบบสอบถามประกอบด้วย:

- คำถามเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลเบื้องต้นของผู้ตอบ ในด้านล่างของหน้าแรกนี้ ขอให้ระบุข้อมูลลงในช่องว่าง (\_\_\_)

- คำถามหลักในหน้า 2-4 มีทั้งหมด 29 ข้อ ในแต่ละข้อของคำถามหลัก จะเป็นคำถามหรือคำถามสั้น ให้ผู้ตอบแบบสอบถามระบุความคิดเห็น โดยมีตัวเลือกความคิดเห็น 2-3 ตัวเลือก ในแต่ละข้อคำถาม / คำกล่าว ขอให้ผู้ตอบเลือกตอบเพียงตัวเลือกความคิดเห็นเดียว ที่ตรงกับความเห็น หรือความรู้สึกของผู้ตอบมากที่สุด เท่าที่จะเป็นไปได้ โดยกากบาท (X) ลงในช่องแสดงความคิดเห็น (\_\_\_) ที่อยู่หน้าตัวเลือกความเห็นแต่ละตัวเลือก ในแต่ละข้อคำถาม / คำกล่าว ซึ่งจะไม่มีคำตอบที่ถูก หรือผิด แต่อย่างใด และคำตอบที่ได้ทั้งหมด จะถูกปิดเป็นความลับ

ขอขอบคุณ ในความอนุเคราะห์ที่ตอบแบบสอบถามมา ณ ที่นี้  
ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร. พิษณุ เสงี่ยมพงษ์

คำถามเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลเบื้องต้น

เพศ \_\_\_\_\_

ศาสนา \_\_\_\_\_

คณะที่ศึกษา \_\_\_\_\_

ระดับปริญญา (ตรี / โท / เอก) \_\_\_\_\_ ชั้นปีที่ \_\_\_\_\_

สถาบัน (มหาวิทยาลัย) \_\_\_\_\_

ประมาณรายได้ในครอบครัวของท่าน (โปรดเลือกเพียงคำตอบเดียว)

\_\_\_\_\_ น้อยกว่า 10,000 บาท

\_\_\_\_\_ 30,001 – 40,000 บาท

\_\_\_\_\_ 10,001 – 20,000 บาท

\_\_\_\_\_ 40,001 – 50,000 บาท

\_\_\_\_\_ 20,001 – 30,000 บาท

\_\_\_\_\_ มากกว่า 50,000 บาท



12. ท่านคิดอย่างไร กับการที่รัฐเก็บภาษี ที่บ่งชี้ความมั่งมี เช่นภาษีมรดก หรือภาษีที่ดิน ในอัตราสูง ๆ แล้วนำภาษีนั้น มากระจายให้ผู้มีรายได้น้อย
- \_\_\_ ยุติธรรม  
\_\_\_ ไม่ยุติธรรม
- 
13. หากญาติสนิทของท่านชราภาพ และต้องการการดูแลจากท่าน ท่านคงรู้สึก
- \_\_\_ ยินดี แต่อาจไม่ค่อยสะดวก เพราะท่านคงมีภาระหน้าที่อื่นด้วย  
\_\_\_ ยินดี และจะดูแลแน่
- 
14. เมื่อมีรายได้ ท่านยินดีจ่ายภาษี เป็นที่เปอร์เซ็นต์ของรายได้ของท่าน เพื่อให้รัฐนำไปช่วยคนจน \_\_\_\_\_ % (ระบุเปอร์เซ็นต์)
- 
15. ท่านเห็นด้วยกับข้อใดมากกว่ากัน
- \_\_\_ ความแตกต่างของฐานะ ระหว่างคนจน-คนรวย แสดงถึงความบกพร่องของสังคม  
\_\_\_ ความแตกต่างของฐานะ ระหว่างคนจน-คนรวย เป็นเรื่องธรรมดาของสังคม
- 
16. หากสามารถเลือกได้ ท่านจะเลือกไปใช้บริการที่ใด เป็นอันดับแรก
- \_\_\_ โรงพยาบาลของรัฐ  
\_\_\_ โรงพยาบาลเอกชน
- 
17. หากรัฐบาล จะเก็บภาษีเพิ่มจากท่าน เมื่อท่านมีรายได้ เพื่อนำมาพัฒนาคุณภาพบริการขนส่งสาธารณะ เช่น รถประจำทาง รถไฟฟ้า รถไฟ ท่านคิดอย่างไร
- \_\_\_ เห็นด้วย  
\_\_\_ ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย
- 
18. ท่านคิดอย่างไร: ประชาชนไทย ควรได้รับการปฏิบัติโดยกฎหมาย เสมอเหมือนกัน
- \_\_\_ เห็นด้วย  
\_\_\_ เจย ๆ  
\_\_\_ ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย
- 
19. ท่านคิดอย่างไร: ประชาชนไทย ควรได้รับบริการด้านการศึกษาฟรีจากรัฐ จนจบชั้นมัธยม หรือเทียบเท่า เสมอเหมือนกัน
- \_\_\_ เห็นด้วย  
\_\_\_ เจย ๆ  
\_\_\_ ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย
- 
20. ท่านคิดอย่างไร: ประชาชนไทย ควรได้รับแบ่งทรัพยากรในสังคม เช่นทรัพย์สิน ความมั่งคั่ง และรายได้ อย่างเท่าเทียมกัน
- \_\_\_ เห็นด้วย  
\_\_\_ เจย ๆ  
\_\_\_ ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย
- 
21. หากต้องเลือก ท่านเลือกข้อใดก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก
- \_\_\_ งานที่ชอบ  
\_\_\_ งานที่ได้เงินดี
-



22. หากต้องเลือก ท่านจะเลือกร่วมทำงานกับใครก่อน เป็นอันดับแรก  คนที่มีชื่อเสียงในสังคม  
 คนดี

23. ท่านคิดอย่างไร: เงิน เป็นที่มาของความทุกข์ได้มาก  เห็นด้วย  
 ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย

24. ท่านมักจะเลือกอยู่ในกลุ่มคนที่มีสถานภาพทางสังคม-เศรษฐกิจใกล้เคียงกับท่าน  ใช่  
 ไม่ใช่

25. ในสังคมนรอบ ๆ ตัวท่าน คนที่มีสถานภาพทางสังคม-เศรษฐกิจใกล้เคียงกัน มักรวมกลุ่มอยู่ด้วยกัน  คิดว่าจริง  
 ไม่น่าจะจริง

26. คนจนมักเสียเปรียบคนรวย  เห็นด้วย  
 ไม่ค่อยเห็นด้วย

27. ท่านบริจาคเงิน-สิ่งของ ปอชแคโทน  ปอช  
 ไม่ค่อยปอช

28. ท่านทำงานอาสาสมัคร ปอชแคโทน  ปอช  
 ไม่ค่อยปอช

29. ท่านประกอบกิจกรรมทางศาสนา ปอชแคโทน  ปอช  
 ไม่ค่อยปอช



สถาบันบริการ  
 จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย